

THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF
HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

EDITED BY S. C. CARPENTER, D.D.

VOLUME XXXII.
JANUARY—JUNE, 1936

LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

THE BOSTON

A MONTHLY JOURNAL

HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY

VOLUME 12

VOLUME XXII

NUMBER 1

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the VERY REV. S. C. CARPENTER, D.D., THE DEANERY, EXETER, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXII

JANUARY, 1936

No. 187

EDITORIAL

THE use which is commonly made of Advent Sunday and of the first of January is characteristic. As we said last month, Advent is undoubtedly the beginning of the Christian Year, and no one can complain when the Vicar wishes the congregation a Happy New Year on that day. But it was an over-statement to pretend that no one is surprised when he does so. They are all faintly surprised, and in their secret heart they think it is a little academic. So it is, though it must be remembered that academic is not a word implying any blame. It is academic in that it depends upon a pure (and true) theory, and that the assumption commonly made by plain people does not correspond with it. Most people will go on supposing that the New Year begins in January. Thus the pastoral use made of this double beginning is a good illustration of the twofold work of the Church. The priest in a parish exists in order that he may minister to the faithful what they desire to have, namely the Word and Sacraments of Christ. He also exists for certain other purposes, whether of an evangelistic or of a more general diffused kind. It is his duty to exhort the unfaithful, and also to be ready to sign pension papers and to help and advise about all sorts of things. In this second department of his work, evangelistic and general service, he must be prepared to take any ground that people will concede to him and to build on it for the glory of God. He will be always on the look-out for favourable points of access, and for regions where the interests of the Gospel and the interests of natural life can properly be said to overlap.

Inspired by this twofold vocation, the Vicar, having already given his novennial benediction on Advent Sunday, will cheerfully give it again on the first Sunday in January. Having

acted quite properly a month ago as a priest of the Church, he will act again, no less properly, as the friend of his people. On both occasions he will link his greetings with the Nativity. In January he will have the actual advantage of setting out from an already accomplished fact, of being able to say: "The Master is come, and calleth for thee." If he should then quote the majestic words of the Apocalypse, "Behold, I make all things new," they will then make less demand, not indeed on faith (their demand on that remains inexorable and gigantic) but on imagination. There is already in the minds of his hearers the picture of the Christ-Child, newly-come, committed to the world, trusting its chivalry, submitted to the perils and cruelties of life, appealing to no resources other than those which are embodied in His human infancy and in His divine love. For those who have this in mind the question is close at hand—What do you mean to do with this Child of the Heavens, domiciled among you? Externally, His course among us is already fixed. He is to be manifested to Gentiles, in infancy to a few representatives at the first Epiphany, and thereafter in His works to all who do not close their eyes. Then there is to be, at Septuagesima, a reminder that the true purpose of God's Creation has been obscured by sin. This in Lent will sharpen into a call to penitence, and at the end of Lent there will be seen the climax of the drama, the Son of David going out alone into the arena to battle with Goliath.

This is, externally, what is to be expected. But there is more than that. "I make all things new" is searchingly personal. Each man is conscious that he has much in himself that very urgently needs to be renewed. What am I going to do with the Holy Child committed to me? That is the sort of self-examination which will save the man from self-confidence on the one hand and depression on the other. There is depression about. Priests in small country parishes sometimes get depressed. God knows, it is a hard and lonely life. And the faithful laity sometimes lose heart. A farm labourer said lately to a visiting priest, "You told us in your talk that when the old monasteries were dissolved, they had rather come to the end of their usefulness. That is just what some people say to me about the Church. I'm an eight o'clock man myself, I like to give the best I have at the beginning of the day, but these Evensong people haven't got much hold on the thing. They say that they've had Parson here these twenty years, and they know what he'll say in pulpit. Why should they go to church and hear it over again?" One answer is perhaps that, just as

pious founders in the fourteenth or fifteenth century, instead of founding any more monasteries, began to found Colleges where Christian education could be given, so it is time now for the Church to learn some new ways, to carry on the George Herbert and the John Keble and the Charles Kingsley tradition with the same sort of wise redirection of resources as that which inspired Wolsey or Chichele or Alcock in their redirection of monasticism. But even this does not go quite deep enough. The cure for the trouble, in both parson and people, is just that personal, Evangelical belief that Christ is ours, committed to our care, which we ought to have always, but above all when the Feast of the Nativity has just come round again. We all wonder at times why we sinned like that, and that, and that. The reason is forgetfulness of the ever-present Saviour. John Bunyan's lines—

Let him in constancy
Follow the Master—

have a bold ring about them. But they are open to the charge, paradoxically enough, that they suggest the possibility of being justified by works. The real Gospel is expressed in the words of St. Patrick's Breastplate:

Christ be with me, Christ within me,
Christ behind me, Christ before me,
Christ beside me, Christ to win me,
Christ to comfort and restore me,
Christ beneath me, Christ above me,
Christ in quiet, Christ in danger,
Christ in hearts of all that love me,
Christ in mouth of friend and stranger.

This is Christianity, the cure alike for pride and for despair.

The Report of the Archbishops' Commission on the Ministry of Women is an interesting document, containing much historical information, though we confess that we had expected, perhaps unfairly, that it would treat the subject on a larger scale. In particular, it would have been of great value if we could have had a record of the evidence on which the verdicts are based. The chief constructive merits of the Report are (1) that it proposes to end the uncertainty which has long lain over the Order of Deaconesses, and (2) that it commends in the warmest and heartiest way the work of lay women. The Deaconesses, ever since the Order was revived in England in 1862, have done work of such extraordinary value that it is strange that they have not gone ahead more strongly in numbers and in public estimation. Those who have knowledge of their work

are enthusiastic; others are vague and uncertain. Does "set apart" mean the same thing as "ordain"? Do Deaconesses receive Holy Orders, indelible and conferring "character"? In the Report of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 there seemed no doubt about it. The language used in 1930 was in some respects more hesitating, but it appeared afterwards that the hesitation was due to legal difficulties about the position of "persons in Holy Orders." The effect of 1930 on the Deaconesses themselves and their friends was disturbing, but the Commission takes the view that an advance was made. What was put forward was the view that the Order of Deaconesses is a real Order *sui generis*, not a pale reflexion of the Order of Deacons, which has itself departed so widely from the primitive model. Along this line it seems that genuine progress can be made. It is surely important, where women are advancing, not without difficulty, and have manifestly a great deal to give, that those who are admitted to a Ministry should come to be thought of as women doing for Christ and His Church a work which women alone can do, and not as inferior Deacons. If the large recommendations of the Commission be accepted, the recognition and use of the Deaconess as an ordained, clerical person will leave little to be desired.

The other main group of suggestions relates to the work of lay women. The Commission has evidently had access to some of the experience gathered by the diocesan Boards of Women's Work, now happily established in nearly all dioceses, and the Central Council thereof. The members of the Commission perceive that the time has come when there should be set up a Central College for general training. At present there is thoroughly good training in the Deaconess Houses, and shorter general courses elsewhere. There are also excellent specialist trainings, as at St. Christopher's, the Josephine Butler House, and St. Agnes, Clapham. This does not cater for all needs, and if the hopes of the Commission are realized the need for further facilities will be clear. Their hope is (i.) that women of first-rate education will more and more see in Church work a real vocation, giving scope for the use of all their gifts, and that the duty which will be entrusted to women in Parishes, Education, Moral Welfare and General Social Work will be serious, responsible and, in the true sense, attractive. The Commission approves the principle for which the governing bodies of Women's Work have long stood, that wherever true vocation has appeared, ability should be schooled by adequate training and tested by examination, and that duly qualified women should then be licensed by the Bishop. They look forward to the time when every considerable parish will have

as a matter of course its properly trained and properly remunerated Woman Worker. Over and above the parishes, there are the large fields of special work. About these, especially the field of education in school and college, many interesting and important things are said. One of the things which the Commission has not done is to find a new and better name for this new class of qualified, professional women. "Woman Worker" is profoundly true, but that is about all that can be said in its favour as a name.

One real difficulty is that there are few posts of large-scale leadership. Great numbers of women are chiefly interested in work of a personal kind, which is the reason why they make such good visitors, and they do not mind if very much of it is of a routine character. Some feel that either they themselves, or other women, could direct and rule. It may well be so. Experience elsewhere suggests it. Yet there is not much work of that kind available. But this is not all. The Commission have faced—they could not avoid it—the claim, made in some quarters, that women may be called of God to the priesthood. With one exception, they find that the exceeding gravity of the departure from the principle and practice of the Church which would be involved in the Ordination of a woman priest constitutes an indication of the divine will. At the same time they are clearly dissatisfied with some of the arguments which were produced before them in defence of the existing practice. The appendix, in which the one dissentient from the general view explains his position, forms, with Professor Grensted's psychological discussion of the same problem, the most interesting portion of the Report.

An attractive little Commentary, *The College St. Luke*, by P. N. F. Young (The Christian Literature Society for India, Rs. 1.4), has reached us. Mr. Young says that he has aimed at producing something readable, and he has succeeded. It is the kind of commentary that will bear being read through continuously. Pastoral and missionary experience combine with theological and psychological knowledge to interpret the historical and doctrinal meaning of the Gospel. The book is clearly designed for Indian readers, but it contains nothing that unsuits it for the West.

Those who from time to time are rather disconcerted, as they go about, to see the exotic flowers that bloom, whether by

design or by the accident of ignorance, in many of our parochial (and Cathedral) gardens of the soul, will be refreshed by *A Server's Manual*, published by Messrs. Mowbray (1s. 9d.) for the Alcuin Club. It is strictly in the English tradition. The picture on the jacket of an English altar, with side-curtains, the priest in an appparelled alb and a decent, flowing vestment, and the server in a winged rochet, is a sight for sore eyes. The ceremonial directions are severely English, so unbending that they startle the rather hybrid tradition into which may of even the well-intentioned among us have allowed ourselves to fall, and they are likely to be followed with some modifications here and there. But the book suggests a dignified and comely order, which does justice to the strength and beauty of the English Rite.

St. Clair Donaldson, Bishop of Salisbury, was in his earlier London days one of the pioneers of the J.C.M.A., and was plainly well fitted for the bishopric of distant Brisbane. Once there, he made so great an impression on the Church in Australia that he very soon became Metropolitan of Queensland. When Dr. F. E. Ridgeway died in 1921, it appears from what is rather irreverently called "Bell's Life" that "the Archbishop set his heart on securing the appointment for Dr. Donaldson." Mr. Lloyd George, whose personal preference was for orators who could sway multitudes, consented, and the Archbishop was even able to obtain time for the Bishop-elect to postpone his return to England from June to October in order that he might attend the General Synod of the Church in Australia and Tasmania. It seems that, while the Crown nominates, the Metropolitan, as the administrant of the see during a vacancy, decides when the new Bishop shall take up his work. At Salisbury Donaldson was the ideal Bishop of a country diocese. He was utterly devoted to three things, the service of God, the care of his parishes, and promoting the claims of overseas work. It is said that some in Wilts and Dorset whispered that the Bishop spent many days in London at the Missionary Council, but those who knew his life were aware that he made up for this by doing the work of two men. His travels in the diocese were incessant and his pastoral sympathies unbounded. We happen to know that one day last Lent he hurried from a Confirmation to a very remote part of the diocese to the funeral of one of the clergy, returned in time to snatch a mouthful of food, and then presided over a lecture in his own house to Salisbury people on "Life after Death." A member of the Assembly remarked when he gave up the Chairmanship of the Missionary

Council, "I think it is perhaps time that we had a rather drier vintage to introduce the Report of the Council." It was a witty comment, and, though it may sound a trifle cynical, it was said in all affection, and it was actually a real tribute to the man. There was a simple exuberance about his piety to which not all could rise, but all saw in him a godly Bishop, one of the great Christians of our time.

CHRISTIANITY AS A HISTORICAL RELIGION*

It is a singular honour to be invited to deliver the first of a series of Lectures founded in this Abbey Church of Westminster in memory of one of the greatest teachers who have from its pulpit influenced the thoughts and lives of men. Those whose minds were just awaking to the problems of theology at the time when Charles Gore was delivering here his famous lectures can never forget the debt they owe him; and though, as it happens, I never heard one of those lectures, I studied them among the first of any theological writings that I ever read, and received from them a stimulus, a direction of thought, for which I must always be grateful. A little later I began to know personally and to love and honour the man himself. He was the chief source of pioneering energy in the Church, both in pure and in applied theology, for a quarter of a century; and upon those who knew him he exercised a charm at once fascinating and compelling. Alike for the man himself and for his work we give thanks to God.

It is right that he should be commemorated here by lectures designed not only to recall his name but to perpetuate his influence by aiding successive generations to think out for themselves afresh the bearing upon their own time of that unchanging Gospel which Gore both faithfully proclaimed and fearlessly applied. Men were puzzled sometimes when it seemed that the pioneer was standing on the defensive, or that the liberal and even radical theologian was for the moment a chief bulwark of conservatism. But Gore was far too great and far too Christian to be either merely liberal or merely conservative. He was, as he might himself have said, "profoundly convinced" that God has given to men a revelation of Himself which stands for ever; no progress of thought can alter that; the Gospel is unchanging. In defence of that revelation as once and for all given in Jesus Christ, Perfect God and Perfect Man, he stood with the most conservative. But this unchanging truth has to be commended to the changing minds of men and applied to their changing circumstances. Therefore in the understanding and interpretation of that truth all fresh light from new knowledge was to be welcomed; and there were always new problems in the social and industrial

* The Inaugural Lecture of the Charles Gore Memorial Lectures, delivered in Westminster Abbey on November 19, 1935.

order to which the unchanging principles of the Gospel must be applied; and in all work of theological interpretation and of Christian politics Gore was found among the progressive and sometimes among the radicals.

The general subject of these lectures is "Historical Christianity." I conceive that this phrase is to be interpreted in its largest sense so that it not only covers the questions of Christian origins, or the importance of those origins, but the historical character of Christianity as it is transmitted from one generation to another and is actually at work among us, still carrying forward to accomplishment that divine purpose which made itself fully known through the Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus Christ and through the Mission of the Holy Spirit.

For Christianity presents itself to us as a movement continuous through the centuries and reaching us in forms given to it by the experience of many generations. It is living and still in growth; in every period it has new manifestations. Yet it is one with itself throughout in virtue of its essential principle, which is the unchanging Gospel. It is historical in a degree quite peculiar among the religions of the world. For its very essence is bound up with its historical origin, and its activity is that of a historical movement moulding history from within.

We consider first the relation of Christianity to its historical origin. I am not here concerned only with the events recorded in the Gospels. The sacred writings of Christianity are not limited to the four Gospels, but are found in the Bible as a whole. And the Bible is preponderantly concerned with history. It regards history from its own angle of vision; but its concern is with history none the less—with history as seen in the light of the knowledge of God. That knowledge was, before Christ came, limited not only by man's understanding but by the evidence available. God had not fully disclosed Himself; consequently the prophetic reading of history which we have in the historical books of the Old Testament (ranked by the Jews as prophetic books), and in the oracles of the prophets themselves, is open to correction by way of supplement when the fuller revelation comes. But it is part of the entire self-disclosure of God, and provided that its contents are read in the light of their own fulfilment or completion in Jesus Christ, it is to be regarded as an indispensable part of the initial *datum*—the given fact—from which Christianity starts.

Two features are in a special sense characteristic of the Old Testament reading of history. First there has been since a period before the distinction of history from myth a community conscious of bearing a divine commission. If the name of

Abraham is to be understood as representing rather a tribal migration than an individual called forth from his father's house, that only emphasizes the more strongly the antiquity of this divinely commissioned community. In Abraham and the promise to his seed, in Israel the chosen people, we find the centre of the prophetic interest; it is through them that all nations shall be blessed. The purpose of God for mankind, which includes all nations, is to be worked out through the divinely commissioned community—through Israel.

We may note in passing how much more closely this view of salvation through a community coheres with the modern understanding of human personality than does the notion of purely individual salvation which was a natural accompaniment of the Renaissance and of the period of Cartesian philosophy. We have been led to discard the notion of human beings as being, or having within them hard, atomic cores of individuality. Personality is inherently social. We only become fully personal through the interaction of our own and other selves in the fellowship of society. Not only must everyone who speaks of himself as "I" recognize that every other one also speaks of himself as "I," but he must recognize that "I" am only "I" at all because "Thou" art "Thou" and "Ye" are "Ye." Our personality is a social product, and spiritual liberty is a resultant of social determinations.

This doctrine of the chosen people or commissioned community is utterly different from, though its inception may have been facilitated by, the notion of gods proper to the several nations and nations proper to the several gods. Jephthah is represented as equating the relation between Jehovah and Israel with that between Chemosh and Moab. But in fact this was felt as something quite different. For Jehovah was initially the God of Sinai, with which Israel had nothing to do except to reach it on their wanderings, and He entered into His special relation to Israel by covenant. In other words, the relation of Israel to Jehovah was from the beginning neither a natural nor (still less) physical one; it was always essentially moral. Consonantly with this, Jehovah was known as righteous and demanding righteousness in His worshippers. These two elements in the one conception qualified it for expansion into that of the One God of Heaven and Earth. But so soon as this had happened the old covenant relation was profoundly modified. For now it had to be recognized that if God had brought Israel out of Egypt, no less had He brought the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir; so that the commission to Israel does not come from one who is God of Israel only, but from the God of all the earth, whose will includes the welfare

of all nations. Not only Israel is blessed in the seed of Abraham, but all nations of the earth; Israel is to be a third with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth, for that the Lord hath said, Blessed be Egypt My people, and Assyria the work of My hands, and Israel Mine inheritance. Thus the stage is set for the great revolution of the Gospel, whereby the chosen people or commissioned community is freed from all national or racial limitations.

Thus the first characteristic feature of the Old Testament derives its special quality from the second—the commissioned community derives its special quality from the God who gives the commission. It is the faith in God as Righteous Will, having His purpose for history, so that alike the worship of God and the welfare of man find their principle in conformity to that Will—it is this faith which above all else marks off the Old Testament from other sacred literature of the ancient world. God is not a static principle or essence, but a living spirit, at once the source, the guide and the goal of history.

Accordingly His revelation of Himself is effected chiefly through historical events. The emphasis lately placed upon the progressive knowledge of God apparent in the prophets has to some extent obscured the fact that the prophets were primarily concerned to interpret the acts of God which were taking place before their eyes. In the deliverance from Egypt, in the conquest of Palestine, in the rise of Assyria, in the retreat of Sennacherib, in the Exile and in the Return, they trace God's purpose fulfilling itself and His judgment at work. They do this through a spiritual illumination of their own minds, but what that illumination brings is seldom knowledge of general truths such as can be formulated in propositions; it is the understanding of particular things which God has done or is doing. The essential Revelation is in the event, though it requires inspiration from God to enable mortal man to interpret the event aright.

This principle, characteristic of the Old Testament, finds its fullest illustration in the New. The Gospel-Revelation is given in the fact—the event—of Jesus Christ. But if none had had eyes to see and ears to hear, it would have been given in vain. "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth"; in that event is the essential Revelation. But if it was to produce its fruit there was need for some who should see the event for what it was, who should "behold His glory, glory as of an only-begotten from a Father." In the coincidence of the divinely given event and the divinely enlightened mind the Revelation is both actual and effectual.

But is it so necessary that the supposed event should occur

on the plane of history? The ideal stands and is equally valid whether or not any fact corresponds to it; does the question of fact greatly signify? That is the enquiry stimulated in most people's minds by the title of these Lectures—The Historical Element in Christianity. I have adopted that approach to it which I have followed because I am convinced that this enquiry is conducted rightly only if it is seen in the context of the whole Christian and Biblical tradition. But it may be worth while to set out the view which isolates the Gospel-narrative and then treats its historical accuracy as unimportant.

An upholder of this view may be imagined speaking as follows: "Man's supreme need is to know the character of the ultimate and all-controlling Reality which is called God. All questions of practical conduct depend for their answer in the last resort upon our conception of that ultimate Reality. The Gospel proclaims that its character is in fact that of Jesus Christ. Those who first made this declaration believed that the Figure which they presented was historical both in the sense that He actually lived and died and rose again, and that He was in His own essential nature such as they described. This, however, is unimportant to us. The figure presented, whether historically actual or not, is the image of the invisible God, and we think rightly of God when we think of Him thus."

Such is a view sometimes propounded. It can claim the support of no less a name than Spinoza, who writes in the Seventy-Third Epistle—"I say that it is not altogether necessary to salvation to know Christ according to the flesh; but concerning that Eternal Son of God, that is the eternal wisdom of God which has manifested itself in all things, and especially in the Mind of Man, and most of all in Christ Jesus, a widely different opinion is to be held. For apart from this no one can attain to the state of blessedness inasmuch as this alone teaches what is true and false, what is good and bad."

All that is positive in this view Christians must approve and accept. But is it enough? What is really at stake in the difference between this view and the traditional doctrine of the Church with its emphasis on the historical character of its records? There are many ways in which this question may be approached; I will attempt to outline two of these.

First the question may be asked of one who clings to the Christian conception of God while indifferent to the historical standing of the events which were supposed to give rise to it—What evidence have you that God is of this character? The answer must, so far as I can see, take one of two forms, or a combination of these. The first is an assurance that this conception of God has an overwhelming appeal to the moral

reason; before the central Figure of the Gospel narrative our spirits bow in reverent adoration, and in that worship find themselves in communion with God Himself. Christ may or may not have lived before men's bodily eyes; but He lives now before the eyes of the soul, which knows that its vision of Him is no illusion because it is an experienced communion with the Divine; the worship of Christ is a self-authenticating experience. The second form of answer is a claim that if this clue be accepted, it provides the principle of a general philosophy more satisfying to reason than any of its rivals, and a source of guidance in the handling of particular problems which vindicates itself in proportion to the confidence reposed in it.

No Christian should wish to dissent from those two contentions; each is part of any complete Christian apologetic, and in combination they are very weighty. Yet if that is all they fall short of what a living faith requires in two ways. First, a view which rests on these contentions only coheres with the pagan thought of God as eternally static Being—an object of devout contemplation, a pattern of perfection to which we may try to conform ourselves, but not a living Person Himself, active in direction of the world and of the souls that He has made. The Gospel becomes the unveiling of eternal truth, and not an act of God historically wrought within the framework of time and of history for the redemption and direction of history itself. Once again, the positive element is true and vital. The Gospel is the unveiling of eternal truth; but if it is also a temporal divine act, that fundamentally affects the nature of the truth revealed.

This point becomes clearer as we pass to the second point. If God is indeed such Love as the life of Christ discloses, He must have taken action to express that love. That He should stimulate men's minds to form a vision of that love is not enough. If it exists, it must act. If we are to think of God in terms of Christ, as we are rightly urged to do, it must be because He truly is Christlike—that is to say, that He acts and endures for love's sake as Christ acts and endures. A love which does not act and endure is less than a love which does. Unless the Incarnate Life of Christ is truly an activity of God, God is less perfect than His own image. In other words, that which this view in its detachment from history upholds can only be true if the detachment from history is erroneous. Christ can rightly have for us the value of God only if He actually is God, and is actually come in the flesh.

But if such a divine act has occurred, this throws light on the God who wrought it, not only because its quality must represent His quality but because its occurrence illustrates

His nature. If He acted then, it follows He is not to be conceived as Static Being, whom we reverently contemplate, but as living Will to whom our wills must be conformed. This is the very essence of the Biblical revelation. God is the living God—active, energizing Will. The character of that Will is Love—such love as we see in Jesus Christ. He does not merely represent or symbolize that Love; He actually is the Divine Love in active self-expression—the Word of God.

This characteristic and general claim made by the Church for its Lord introduces contingency into the very core of faith. To some that seems a grievous calamity. They would wish that all matters of faith should be eternal and necessary truths. But necessity in that logical sense of the term is always to be attained only at the cost of complete detachment from fact. It is an ideal of the mathematician. There may be a true necessity for all that happens, but its ground is either the entire sum of all existence or else the principle of this, which is the Will of God. Neither of these is within our comprehension, except so far as God has taken action to reveal Himself; and that action, however truly it may in itself be necessitated by His character, must appear contingent to us who know His character only through His acts. The contingency, the uncertainty in a logical sense, which belongs to any historically grounded faith, is one aspect of its quality as rooted in fact. The Christian will not lament the fact that his faith is exposed to question on historical grounds, because that is merely incidental to its supreme glory as a historical faith. It could only escape that kind of uncertainty by also losing its grip upon the actual world.

With such thoughts in mind we go back to the story of the divinely commissioned community—to Israel. Though the commission was to the nation, not all members of the nation were worthy of it. Prophets perceived that it would actually be discharged by a remnant. Above all, the Second Isaiah, who at first identifies the Servant of the Lord with Israel as a whole, learns that only a faithful few deserve that title; and as he looks forward that few shrink to a single individual, upon whom the Lord lays the iniquity of all. And so it proved. The destiny of Israel duly culminated in the coming of the Messiah; but Israel was not able to receive Him. "He came to His own home, and His own people received Him not." Some indeed received Him and thus became fit to be, later on, His witnesses. One recognized Him for what He was, and thereby earned his promised new name of Peter, the man of rock upon which the new Ecclesia—the new Israel—should be built. Yet the rock was not yet stable. At the crisis "all the disciples forsook

Him and fled"; and though the Rock-man followed, it was afar off—to the place where he would say, "I do not know the man." In the supreme moment, when the Lord performed His distinctively Messianic act—"the Son of Man must suffer"—He was alone. He and He only was then faithful to the commission. Israel, considered not as a nation among the nations but as the chosen instrument of God, was concentrated in His person. When in obedience to His own commission, in which that of Israel found fulfilment, He poured out His soul unto death, He alone was the faithful remnant, He alone was the true Israel, the Ecclesia, the Church of God. He did not found that Church; it was there from the time of Abraham; but He redeemed it and reconstituted it in His own person, so that from that time onwards the condition of membership in that Church is not that a man be born of the seed of Jacob, but that he be incorporated into Christ—a thing beyond the scope of nature or human volition and to be accomplished only by the Holy Spirit.

Thus the distinctively Christian Church, which is the old Ecclesia or Israel reconstituted in Christ, takes its place in the divine economy of history—a place (in ideal, at least) of pervasive and controlling influence, but a place definitely within history, from which it may mould the course of history. For here, too, the Christian religion is essentially historical. The Church is no refuge of escape whereby men flee from the evils of this world to the bliss of the next. Religion often presents itself as what psychologists call an escape-fantasy. Such religion is enervating, demoralizing, bad. But Christianity is no such way of escape. It is a challenge to the world, not a flight from it. He who would fight manfully under Christ's banner against the world, the flesh and the devil must not be entangled in them himself; therefore the detachment or world-renunciation is called for. But such detachment is not itself the end; it is the means to an end. The end is victory over and conquest of the world, only fully achieved when "the Kingdom of the world is become the Kingdom of our God and of His Christ."

Certainly it cannot be argued from Scripture that history will move forward to that consummation by steady progress. There is much to encourage an expectation that hostile forces will grow stronger and faith grow dim before the Lord by His own victorious action closes the historical epoch in the triumphant inauguration of His reign. But though we are led to hope for a consummation of history which lies beyond its process, we are also everywhere led to believe that what makes up history is vitally important in eternity. The purpose of God is for

Eternity, but it includes Time in its scope; the supreme values are spiritual, but spirit is chiefly manifest in control and direction of the material.

From this two consequences follow concerning our religious life today; the one affects the conception of the Church, the other our obligation as members of it. The Church is the ancient people of God reconstituted in Jesus the Messiah. That consideration throws light on the number of the Apostles; it is of real importance that our Lord chose Twelve that they might be with Him. He deliberately sets at the head of the reconstituted Israel a group of men corresponding to the Patriarchs whose names were borne by the tribes of Israel. After the Ascension, the first action of the eleven remaining Apostles is to fill up their number. And the Seer who wrote the Book of Revelation sees the eternal Church in the persons of four-and-twenty elders—the Church before its redemption with the twelve Patriarchs at its head, the Church after its redemption with the twelve Apostles at its head. So, too, the gates of the Heavenly Jerusalem have the names of the twelve tribes, its foundations have the names of the twelve Apostles. The Apostolic Church certainly attached importance to the number of the Apostles as signifying continuity with the Church of the Old Covenant.

And that continuity, expressed and guaranteed in the Apostolic Succession of the Church's Ministry, is still of high importance. This is not the place to enter upon discussion of its relative importance in comparison with other expressions of continuity. But it is relevant here to maintain that deep concern for Catholic Order may be part of a recognition that God offers His saving grace through the objective and historical redemptive acts of Jesus Christ, and that we now receive that grace from those redemptive acts through the continuous witness and ministration of the Church. It is possible at least to value Catholic Order precisely because of its coherence and congruity with the Evangelical facts.

The Church stands before us as the divinely commissioned community, stretching back into the mists where history passes into myth and legend. Man is inherently social; his salvation must be in and through a society if it is to touch the roots of his being; and such a society we find to be in fact the instrument of God. It is itself a movement in history, and that movement is not yet finished. We find ourselves in the midst of it; we are heirs of its past, but we are in some degree the moulders of its future. If we are to be worthy and living members of this Israel of God, it must be by acting upon the world around us in the power of that Spirit who is Himself the informing

principle of the Church. We cannot make our membership in Christ's Body a way of escape, or of comfort, amidst the trials of life; for that is not a characteristic of His Body. If we are very members incorporate in that Body we must yield ourselves to its indwelling Spirit, that we may be used for the healing of the world's diseases and, if need be, broken for the purging of its evils—filling up what remains over of the sufferings of Christ for His Body's sake.

So we set ourselves in the Spirit of Christ to attack and destroy the world's evils—war, bad housing, unemployment and other evil conditions, as well as pride, greed, lust and malice and all evil states of the soul. We note the witness to the power of faith given by those who have preceded us, and set ourselves also to run with endurance our own race.

Truly it is a great theme that has been chosen for these Lectures—"Historical Christianity." That is not a matter of one phase or moment, however central; it is a quality of Christianity itself. Our religion is more than historical; its spring and its goal are in eternity, for they are in God. Yet it is at every point historical. Nay, it is more than this. It is itself the very essence of history, for it is the age-long working out of the divine purpose in Creation and Redemption, "the mystery (or open secret) of His will . . . to sum up all things in Christ."

W. EBOR:

THE DIOCESE OF GIBRALTAR AND REUNION

EARLY in this century Bishop Collins, hero and saint, described to the present writer an episode which brings out with extraordinary clearness the strategic position of the Diocese of Gibraltar.

On one of his apostolic journeys he had recently travelled direct by sea from Spain to Constantinople. In Spain he was given a most friendly send-off. He had been courteously entertained by a Roman Catholic archbishop, who told off one of his own chaplains to act as guide to the chief sights of the city. In Constantinople he had an even warmer welcome from the Œcumenical Patriarch. It happened that our bishop was holding an ordination to the diaconate in the Crimean Memorial Church, and the Patriarch sent his representative to be present at the ceremony. The two who shewed him friend-

ship in West and East were not on speaking terms with one another.

The jurisdiction of the Bishop of Gibraltar, covering the Mediterranean and the Black Sea and the adjoining countries, and stretching from the Atlantic shore of Portugal to the Caucasus,* bridges East and West in Christendom. It stands, like the ancient Colossus of Rhodes, astride the great gap, and contains within the territories which it embraces the historic ecclesiastical centres and *foci*, Rome and Constantinople.

If therefore our Anglican Communion is, as it was acclaimed in the Faith and Order Conference at Lausanne, "a bridge-church," ordained by Providence—as our Tractarian forbears and their seventeenth-century predecessors believed—to discharge a real if modest function as mediator in the movement towards Christian reunion, the Gibraltar Diocese may surely claim to be protagonist in that drama.

When the diocese came into being in 1842 at the instance of Bishop Blomfield, the omens pointed towards a *rapprochement* with the Eastern Churches. Dr. Tomlinson, our first bishop, who was Secretary of S.P.C.K., had, shortly before his consecration, been sent out by the Archbishop of Canterbury with a friendly greeting to the Œcumenical Patriarch; and the cultivation of closer relations with Eastern Orthodoxy was among the overt reasons for creating the new jurisdiction.

Bishop Blomfield's primary object in urging the formation of this see, which, while establishing one Anglican bishop on a territorial basis in our colonies of Gibraltar and Malta, would give him oversight of our congregations round the Mediterranean and in the Near East, was doubtless to provide better shepherding for our South European flock.

From time immemorial—the tradition seems to have been hoary in the time of Archbishop Laud—the Bishop of London had been held responsible for the spiritual care of Britons on the high seas and overseas. By the seventeenth century that had become a very serious responsibility, but does not seem to have had serious consideration. That there should have been no bishop appointed for our American colonies till Scotland sent Bishop Seabury seems incredible from our point of view. The gradual formation of Anglican sees in the West and East Indies in the last quarter of the eighteenth and the first of the nineteenth century shews that the responsibility was at least beginning to be realized.

By 1842, when our diocese came into being, the agglomeration of British business residents and long-time winter visitors in

* Palestine and Cyprus are under the Bishop in Jerusalem, and Egypt under our Anglican Bishop who serves the Soudan.

Mediterranean countries had assumed such proportions that the bishopric was urgently needed.

"An episcopal church without a bishop," said Bishop Blomfield, "is a contradiction in terms."

But the desire of closer relations with the Orthodox was equally present in the minds of the prelates assembled at Lambeth in Whitsuntide, 1841, who, after providing for a bishopric for New Zealand, declared: "Our next object will be to make provision for the congregations of our communion established in the islands of the Mediterranean, and in the countries bordering on that sea." It is significant that they provisionally chose Valetta as centre of the new diocese, because "it is evident that the position of Malta is such as will render it the most convenient point of communication with them, *as well as with the bishops of the ancient churches of the East, to whom our Church has been for centuries known only by name.*"

Gibraltar was, however, for a complex of reasons, both civil and ecclesiastical, found to be the more suitable site for the "bishop's stool." And it was to the See of Gibraltar that Bishop Tomlinson was duly consecrated in 1842.

Our first bishop was justly described in 1847 as being "the authentic expositor of the creed of our Church to the long neglected churches of the East" and as "considering this not his least important function."

In spite of the immense differences of atmosphere and of outlook which inevitably separate West from East, the new bishop found that we had much in common beyond the common protest against the overweening claims of Rome and distaste for the latter accretions of its worship. The strictly conservative attitude of the East, the reverence for the Apostolic Age, the passionate devotion to the Œcumenical Councils of the Undivided Church, and the common-sense recognition of autocephalous rights in National Churches—these, and similar factors in Oriental Christendom, provided ample ground for sympathy and understanding.

As a memorial to those who fell in the Crimean War, in which he had contributed his spiritual ministrations, confirming hundreds of our soldiers at Scutari, he urged and strongly promoted the foundation of a stately Church, which should be a centre where Anglicanism might be worthily represented, in the same spirit in which the Anglican Cathedral and College were afterwards built in Jerusalem.

It was reserved for his second successor, Bishop Harris, to consecrate the Crimean Memorial Church, on October 22, 1868, when in his sermon he made express reference to our relations with the Orthodox and Armenian Churches.

Meanwhile, such relations had rapidly developed, and our Church began to be less grievously misunderstood. Bishop Tomlinson used every opportunity of making friends, and a decisive step was taken by his successor, Bishop Trower, when, in consultation with the Armenian Patriarch he refused to receive a congregation of Armenians who, after interpenetration by independent American missions, pleaded for entrance into his flock, feeling that they needed more in the way of episcopal government and liturgical worship. However sincerely we admire the zeal of those American and British Free Church missionaries as a result of whose labours Evangelical churches have sprung up all over Turkey and the Balkan States during the past 100 years; however much we may appreciate the real value of their educational work among the population, it would be idle to deny that their persistent proselytizing has, in the past, greatly embarrassed us in our relations with the Orthodox.

Happily some, at least, of their leaders are now developing a new outlook and a new technique which may mean much for the cause of reunion.

Not only are they among the first to welcome our bishop in his travels—he has had close friends among them since the day when, on Red Cross work, he entered Salonika in 1912 with the victorious Greek army—but they are diverting the proselytizing energies of their emissaries to the Moslems to whom the missions were originally sent, in a growing appreciation of the treasures of Orthodox Christianity.

In "Anatolia College," for which Drs. George E. White and E. W. Riggs are responsible, our bishop found the 200 boys attending the Greek Liturgy—within the College—on Sunday morning: a simplified form of service, and an officiating priest authorized by Gennadius, Metropolitan of Thessalonica.

To return to Bishop Trower and his problem of comity. By this decision of far-seeing statesmanship, we were saved from what amounted to an act of proselytism, and a strong precedent was set for the future policy of the diocese.

The suspicions of the Orientals were allayed, and our bishop could write: "The Greek prelates do not seem to regard the presence of an Anglican bishop in the East as an intrusion, but as the natural and legitimate consequence of the residence of Englishmen. Their theory of Episcopacy is that dioceses are distinguished by race and nations rather than by place."

In 1864 and 1867 he made a point of meeting the Eastern prelates, when possible, at Constantinople, Athens, Smyrna, Corfu and Patras. His successor, Bishop Harris, followed a like policy, as did also Bishop Sandford, to whom, as a former don

of Christ Church, Oxford, the historic appeal of Eastern Orthodoxy was a very real thing.

Of Bishop Collins we have already spoken. During his episcopate even more was done. His zeal for contacts was inexhaustible, and is well illustrated by the romantic story of his pilgrimage in the highlands of Armenia.

His extraordinarily attractive personality, which won so much homage in the Pan-Anglican Congress, could effect much more than a mere formal exchange of courtesies; and when he laid down his office with his life on the fatal voyage to Smyrna, he bequeathed to the Church the treasure of a warmer and more fraternal link with Eastern Christendom.

His successor, Bishop Knight, carried on the same policy in the very difficult conditions of the Great War, where new bonds of sympathy with our Eastern brethren emerged from a community of distress and suffering. But in the last three episcopates, of Bishops Greig, Hicks, and Buxton, the pace of the movement has notably accelerated.

Of the most recent of these activities, the Bucharest Conference of last June, we are still awaiting the results; but, apart from any tangible fruits of the meeting, a real value must attach to the spirit and atmosphere it induced. "It was," says a member of our delegation, "extraordinarily cordial and friendly; and difficulties that seemed insurmountable were made to vanish. To this the Patriarch Miron Cristea contributed not a little by his tact, his skill, his wit, his good humour, and his stupendous hospitality!"

The Roumanian delegation numbered twelve: the Bishops of Roman, Garansebesh and Targoviste, six of the higher clergy, of whom three are professors of theology, and three lay professors. Our own numbered eight: the Bishop of Gibraltar and his predecessor, Dr. Hicks (Chairman), the Bishop of Fulham (our neighbour in "Northern and Central Europe"), the Dean of York, Dr. J. A. Douglas, Canon (now Archdeacon) J. H. Sharp, Dr. A. J. Macdonald and the Rev. Philip Usher. It was drawn, with three notable exceptions, entirely from the past and present staff of the Diocese of Gibraltar. It had two valuable assessors from overseas in the Archbishop of Dublin and Professor Frank Gavin, a member of the sister Church in the United States and of that Church's Council of Ecclesiastical Relations.

The basis of the discussion was the Lambeth Recommendations of 1930, and the main subject brought forward was the status of the Anglican Communion and its Apostolic Succession. Points of agreement and difference were discussed with extraordinary friendliness and frankness, and recommendations

were drawn up which the Roumanian delegation promised to present to their Holy Synod at Bucharest in October. Gestures of friendship were not confined to the ecclesiastical sphere. All the members of the Anglican delegation had audience of King Carol, and received, in various grades, the Order of the Star of Roumania; while the British community, headed by the Minister, Sir Reginald Hoare, and the hospitable chaplain, Mr. Farrie, shewed genuine sympathy and interest in the movement.

The characteristic zeal of Gibraltar for friendly contacts manifested itself, as ever, on this occasion; for the Bishop of Lincoln, accompanied by several of the priests of the delegation, made a point of visiting on their way to Roumania the Patriarch of the Serb Church at Belgrade and the Metropolitan Stephen at Sofia.

A fitting sequel to the June meeting and a notable step in advance was effected by the Bishop of Gibraltar when, on the occasion of our annual festival in July, he completed his triumvirate of archdeacons by the creation of an archdeaconry in South-Eastern Europe.

Our chaplaincies in the Balkan countries are so rare—indeed, the excellent chaplain at Bucharest is for the moment alone in Roumania, and in Yugoslavia, though the lay reader, Mr. P. H. Sitters, does splendid loyal work as liaison officer between Anglican and Serb, we have no resident priest—that a diocesan functionary who can develop contacts in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Albania, and maintain and strengthen those long since formed at Athens and Constantinople, is an asset of the greatest value. And the Bishop's choice has fallen on one who is peculiarly fitted for this task. Archdeacon Sharp has already worked at it under three successive bishops—Greig, Hicks and Buxton: and his linguistic equipment and instinctive sympathy with the Easterns made him a worthy colleague of Canon Douglas in the Roumanian Conference. With Bishop Hicks he had previously visited the late Roumanian Archbishop Nectarie of Czernowitz, and been taken to see four different monasteries in the Bukovina. Before this archbishop passed to his rest he had issued the favourable report on Anglicanism which led to the visit of our June delegation.

In Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, in the absence of stable chaplaincies, it is our bishops themselves that have carried on all that has been done for *rapprochement*; but Archdeacon Sharp has been their constant fellow-traveller and fellow-labourer, and it is from notes supplied by him that the present writer is able to shew evidence of the success of their efforts.

Stephen, Metropolitan of Sofia, has more than once put a

church at their disposal, and was himself present at a Eucharist at which Bishop Hicks was celebrant and participated by giving an address in Bulgarian and French. Our representatives have twice been entertained in Bulgarian seminaries, one just outside Sofia and another in a most picturesque gorge in the Diocese of Vratza, whose bishop, Paissi, was Bulgarian delegate to Lambeth.

In Yugoslavia our bishops have frequently been to Karlovtzi to meet the Serbian Synod, and last May Bishop Hicks, Canon Douglas, Canon Sharp and Mr. Usher had an unofficial talk on Reunion with a committee of the Synod there.

Bishop Dositei of Zagreb (formerly of Nish), Bishop Irinei of Novi Sad and the Bishop of Dalmatia are all keenly interested in us, and Varnarva, the Patriarch, follows the traditions of his predecessor Dmitri in a warm and unvarying attitude of friendship.

If, then, the cultivation of friendly relations "with the bishops of the ancient Church of the East" was, as we have seen, one of the objects with which our diocese was founded, the recent achievements of our leaders testify that Gibraltar, though hard pressed and embarrassed as never before—save, perhaps, during the years of the Great War—has been faithful to her mandate and is preparing for a still more strenuous activity in the near future.

God has blessed this work of ours; and if there have been occasional lapses of sympathy or errors of policy in our officials (Anglicanism still finds it difficult to speak always with one voice!), we may claim that the diocese is largely responsible, under God, for the steady and solid advance of that fraternal spirit between Anglican and Orthodox which is among the most hopeful elements in the general movement towards Reunion.

But Reunion involves West as well as East, and for many reasons a *rapprochement* with the Patriarch of the West is not so easy a matter. These reasons run back to the imperfect relations between England and the Holy See that were visible already in the reign of the first William, that shewed themselves again in the legislation of the Plantagenet kings and those that followed them, but came to a head under Henry VIII. in the sixteenth century.

When we pass from the Oriental archdeaconry to those of the Latin countries we are conscious of a severe and sudden fall in the ecclesiastical temperature!

The late Lord Halifax's activities in the cause of Reunion with Rome, suspected and resented by many of his fellow-churchmen of the opposite wing, may be said to have been justified in principle by Lambeth, as indeed by logic, in their ultimate stage, the Malines Conversations.

But this movement of the English Church Union was carried on from the first to last without overt reference to the Diocese of Gibraltar. It is perhaps significant that on his last visit to Rome the revered Anglo-Catholic leader did not come near our church of All Saints. The Halifax campaign was full of romance and of optimistic knight-errantry, and it would be rash to regard it as a complete failure. Seed of mutual understanding has surely been sown, which will sprout up *in tempore opportuno*. That no definite advance has been made in official relations between the two communions may be due to two principal causes, besides the heritage of agelong hostility and prejudice.

The first is the fact that the dogma of Papal Infallibility, however it is to be interpreted and however much capable of being whittled away in detailed application, sets up a formidable psychological barrier. It makes it more difficult than ever for the Holy See and for its loyal adherents to admit the historically self-evident fact that "the Church of Rome hath erred."

And to many of us it is equally self-evident that a real union of hearts between us and Rome can never come to pass except on a basis of acknowledgment of error and of confession and amendment on *both sides*.

Secondly, there is, of course, the fact that the validity of our orders and sacraments, however fully recognized by honest Roman scholars, cannot be openly and officially admitted without damage to the prestige of the Roman hierarchy in England.

Even the presence of a sympathetic and broadminded occupant of the Roman See of Westminster can hardly be expected to modify the situation seriously, though, thank God, the whole situation can always be ameliorated by the play of honest understanding and Christian charity on the hard crust of inherited prejudice and antipathy.

To other obstacles which stand in the way of a *rapprochement* between Rome and Canterbury must now, unfortunately, be added a measure of jealousy aroused by our steadily growing friendship with the Orthodox.

Under the enlightened régime of Pius XI. Rome has for some years repudiated the policy of individual conversions from the Orthodox Churches and has girded herself to the task of winning over the entire East. But her overtures, of which the aim is, as in her dealings with us, not fraternization but absorption, are still met with suspicion by the Orientals. The contrast between the attitude of Canterbury and that of Rome is obvious to these shrewd Eastern eyes, as is clear from a conversation of Photius of Constantinople with Canon Wigram in 1931. "Our relation with you," said the Patriarch, "has been friendly for long enough; now it ought to develop into something fraternal."

I want you to tell your archbishop that." And the meaning he attached to the word "fraternal" is illustrated by another conversation recorded by Canon Wigram.

A Roman priest visited the Patriarch and asked: "Why are you so friendly with those Protestant English, and not with the Holy Father who longs to welcome you as a son?"

Photius replied: "When the Holy Father is willing, like Canterbury, to be my *brother*, I will indeed welcome him as such." On the official side brotherly relations with Rome are more difficult for us even than for the Orientals. The "unhappy division" is in our case several centuries more recent than in theirs; but the wounds are therefore the more tender and irritable.

In Spain, as in Italy, the diocese has had a hard and uphill fight, as our earlier bishops found, to win reasonable liberty to tend our own flock.

Much yellow water has flowed under the Tiber bridges since Anglicans in Rome were buried, with suicides and murderers, under the Muro Torto of the Pincian Hill; but there may be still some living who remember the "Divine Shed" clinging to the outer wall of the Porta del Popolo, where crowded English congregations worshipped on sufferance and poured out generous offerings on the Roman poor.

For until Rome was made capital of Italy no non-Roman Catholic was allowed to worship within the city. Conditions have ameliorated since then, but even in our own Mediterranean colonies today our British Colonial administration weights the Roman side of the scales. This is natural where the bulk of the population is Roman Catholic. But the prestige of the National Church surely deserves a little more recognition, and British fair play can hardly be said to have full scope in the virulently antagonistic atmosphere of the Maltese prelacy, or on the Rock of Gibraltar where the Church of England civilian cannot find a single Anglican school for his boys. But our purpose is not to dwell on grievances, however many they be, but rather to suggest the ways in which the Diocese of Gibraltar can help and has helped to prepare the way for a better understanding.

From the first the diocese has made it clear that she stands not for anti-Roman propaganda, but simply for the shepherding of her own sheep. That the rule has not always been perfectly observed is evinced by the existence of the Spanish and Portuguese Reformed Churches.

The atmosphere in which these institutions came to birth was that of the revolution of 1868; and the movement represented, perhaps, the spontaneous uprush of forces that had

been latent till revolution brought to the then priest-ridden peninsula a measure of religious toleration.

The organization of these twin Churches is episcopal, and their doctrine based on that of the Church of Ireland. Their first bishop, who has not yet had a successor, was consecrated by Archbishop Plunket after a vain attempt to secure the co-operation of the Old Catholics. There was a strong protest from England at the consecration of Bishop Cabrera, an ex-Roman Catholic priest, and some uneasiness even in Ireland; and Lambeth has never given full recognition to this body.

Its existence raises very puzzling problems in connexion with the policy of our diocese. To ignore it would seem uncharitable, and many a kindly heart is pained at the thought of refusing a helping hand to a group of devotees whose case is partly parallel to that of our own sixteenth-century reformers, and who are in danger through isolation of losing their Catholic ideals and relapsing into pure Protestantism. On the other hand, we recognize that we are pledged to refrain from proselytising baptized Christians; and it would almost be true to say that the *raison d'être* of these Reformed Churches is to turn Catholics into Protestants wholesale.

The solution of the problem is certainly not in sight, but it cannot be deferred for ever.

The principle of the diocese is unmistakable. It is of a piece with the official Anglican policy throughout the world—missions to the heathen, "Missions of Help," perhaps, to fellow-Christians, but no proselytizing among them.

We recognize the Roman Catholic Church as Catholic, and as being, so to speak, "the Church of the country." We acknowledge the Apostolic Succession of her priesthood and the validity of her sacraments; and if there is no counter-recognition of our own status, orders and sacraments, we do not complain. If we have a mission to any group of the baptized outside our own communion, it is to help them to be their true selves. The heroic Archbishop's Mission to the ill-fated Assyrians—contrasting tragically with our political neglect of them—is typical of this Anglican temper. If we have a mission to Roman Catholics in their own countries, it will be of the same quality.

Our people resident in foreign countries, if, and in so far as, they are true to the best traditions of English Churchmanship, are able not only to dispel popular errors about "the Church of England" and to display it as exhibiting in their own lives the fruits of a genuinely Catholic life and teaching, but also, by humility and sympathetic reverence for the religious ideals of those among whom they live, to help them to be their best selves.

At a fortnightly working-party in the Seamen's Institute in Barcelona our English ladies meet in friendliest co-operation with Roman Catholic ladies of the place, and it is obvious to an onlooker that there is a free exchange among them of the good things of human character. Who can doubt that in each direction there passes from time to time a spark of inspiration to live better the life that each one's Church and Creed demand? That such good things can pass professional boundaries I have witnessed myself in Venice and Rome and elsewhere. An instance in point was brought home to me last winter in Algeria when a young French sleeping-car attendant, who had evidently marked my collar, suddenly asked me whether I was a Swiss pastor. I did not realize how great a compliment he had paid me till he explained the reason of his query. Himself a Roman Catholic, he owed more than he could say to an aged Protestant pastor who used to visit the Swiss clinic where he was nursed back to health after the War, and had converted him from a careless and dissolute life to take seriously his own religion.

If a Swiss pastor, I asked myself, why not an Anglican priest, an Anglican layman? And I found the affirmative answer in my experience in the diocese.

We are apt to deplore mixed marriages, and not least because of the rather insulting conditions imposed on the Anglican party by the Roman Curia; but where the Anglican is at his best, full at once of firmness and of charity, these unions, though undesirable in themselves, might do much to further an ultimate Reunion of Christendom by the intimacy of reciprocal relations and the vivid way in which, while husband and wife "agree to differ," each can inspect the fruits of the other's religion at close quarters and find them wholesome and appetizing. One has met families where the father is a staunch and devout Anglican and the Spanish or Italian mother and the children Roman Catholics, and where yet the domestic atmosphere seems cloudless, and the head of the house loses nothing of the respect and affection which should be his by right.

Just as our sojourners in Mediterranean countries are able by the impact of their lives and characters to further the great cause of international brotherhood, quite independently of the discussions which go on at Geneva, so groups of devout and well-shepherded Anglicans can further the "far-off divine event" of a Reunited Christendom, irrespective of the failure of diplomatic relations between Canterbury and the Vatican—by being what they are and by being there. But they must be well-shepherded, and their contact with the best traditions of Anglicanism, at once Catholic and Evangelical, must be kept

vital and strong. That is, from the point of view of Reunion, the *raison d'être* of the Diocese of Gibraltar, which links up these scattered and often isolated groups of believers with the great Church Universal.

And that constitutes the claim of this Cinderella of the diocese, in its intense spiritual and financial struggle, on the prayers and alms of the faithful.

LONSDALE RAGG
(Archdeacon of Gibraltar).

ORIGINAL SIN*

AT a very recent period the doctrine of original sin in its most extreme form, though it had almost disappeared from official Christian teaching, was often put forward by non-Christians as a defence of their wrong-doing, or as a grievance against God and against society. "Why," one heard it said, "should I be held responsible for what I have not caused. I did not ask to be born. I did not choose to inherit this sensual and violent nature. I refuse to be held responsible for it."

Though this voice is not quite so clamorous nowadays, the difficulty is still felt and needs to be faced. Its source lies in the use of the word responsibility in the narrow sense of liability to punishment. But such a use of the word narrows and deforms a very important element in life.

It is true that each of us is put into a situation which is not of his own choosing. But what does that imply? We who regard ourselves as the servants of God can get an answer to this question by considering the working of the services which are controlled by the British Government—*e.g.*, the administration of a colony. John Smith, let us say, enters such a service. The responsible officer will place John in the post which will provide him with the exact difficulties which will draw out his peculiar abilities. Those difficulties are already there. He inherits them from his predecessors. But he is made responsible for them. He is responsible "for the district." So in considering our personal problems we have to remember the twofold responsibility which is imposed on John Smith, his responsibility for making the most of himself and his responsibility for his district. He cannot discharge the former except by facing the latter. The parallel is exact. The field in which I can exert my power is the society which surrounds me. Only action can change character. But as long as a man is thinking only of

* This paper is a development of an address given in the course of the Inaugural Meeting of the Theological Society of Trinity College, Dublin, in October, 1935.

himself, he is apt to stereotype his present character. If he is to loosen his complexes, he must forget himself. Absorption in others is the simplest and most thorough way of doing that. It would further assist us to form a right estimate of ourselves and others if we were to reflect that John Smith will be able to ascertain his value to the service by noticing the degree of difficulty in which his superiors place him. If they put him in an easy job, it is obvious that they do not think much of him. If they impose on him a high degree of responsibility, he rightly regards it as an encouragement. If we would consider our lives in the light of these considerations, they would cause us to view our inherited handicaps in a very different way. Each particular weakness of humanity, whatever it may be, must be dealt with by someone. A special task is set to each of us in particular, though, of course, any victory on our part is a gain for humanity. Thus our hereditary dangers, whatever they may be, indicate our special avocation. And while I am thus discussing not so much the actual doctrine of original sin as the shapeless shadow it casts on human life, I take occasion to point out that so long as we inherit advantages from our forefathers, we have no right to complain of unfairness if we inherit their disadvantages. If our forbears have made life difficult for us in some respects, they have made it easy for us in others.

But to speak of heredity is to arouse a hornets' nest of controversy. In its sharpest definition, Original Sin has been said to be an hereditary taint due to the Fall. And the very possibility of an hereditary taint is doubted and indeed fiercely denied. Not only so, but at the present moment very little importance is attached to heredity at all. This may be due to a reaction against the old tradition that the most important fact about a man was his parentage. It is probably due also to the present state of biological discussion. There has been a long dispute among scientists as to the inheritance of acquired characters, and for the time being the weight of evidence appears to be against their existence. It is doubtful, however, whether some of the disputants were clear in their minds as to the real issue. As a result it is felt by many people that if anything has been proved it is that acquired habits are not transmitted—a very different matter.

On the other hand stands the plain fact that a certain stock has a certain character. It is quite certain, for example, that the progeny of a tiger will be beasts of prey, even if brought up in isolation. It seems also certain that some families are peculiarly liable to weakness of the brain and that children are born with diseases upon them. Besides this, the study of

genes shews that a new type may arise in a single individual, and so far from being swallowed up in later generations, may persist with its specialized character even though the change may not be an improvement. Moreover, even in human beings, there are family traits which may have marked effects on moral behaviour. If a man descends from parents with well-developed supra-renal glands, he will probably be passionate, and this fact will have a marked effect on his reactions to life. For better or worse, he will differ from a man whose glands are not so active. His capabilities and his propensities will be different. To a large extent it is true that a man is born with the elements of his character fixed, though whether those elements are combined in a good or bad way is another question, with which education has to deal.

But education is the action of society, and the very mention of society reminds us that our physical inheritance is not our only legacy from the past nor the only determining factor of our propensities. Even if it were true that a child's mind began as a *tabula rasa*, that mind is powerfully affected by the moral atmosphere surrounding it. Individuals are born into a tradition whose origins lie in the remote past. Individuals die out, but the society and its tradition remain established. Whatever may take place later, the child is at first merely a member of society and can scarcely be said to have an individuality of its own. In the early and formative stages its mind is wholly derivative. The past, as enshrined in the men and women around him, is incessantly pressing on him for good and ill. Indeed, as he grows into the environment he becomes part of it and it of him. He is affected, and deeply affected, by all that has gone before.

If we are to understand human nature, we must follow the example of the biologists and cease to study the individual apart from his environment. Indeed, as scientists are insisting, though it is possible, and indeed necessary, to think of a person and his environment as two different entities, it is also impossible to draw a sharp dividing line between them. It is impossible to say where one begins and the other ends. The air forms the environment of a man's body. But it is not altogether outside him. It enters into the lungs, and, in part, passes into the blood, to be carried into every nook of his system. And the well or ill working of that system depends on the composition of the atmosphere in which it moves. Some of us know well how a change of atmosphere may change the body from a ready servant to a sluggish tyrant.

The danger of this illustration is not that we may over-press it, but that we may not carry its analogy far enough. For in

mental life the environment is more penetrating and more decisive than in physical life. The mind takes on a shape which is very largely determined by the ideas presented to it in the society to which it belongs. Thus, however active a man's mind may be, he is sure to take many questions for granted, because society has long adopted a settled attitude towards them. Those of us who struggle hardest to think independently know best that, after all, we are part of our environment. We originate from it, even though we succeed in modifying the proportion of its elements. And although the surface of human society may change with rapidity, its great habits of thought change very slowly, if at all. Our England is very different from that of Shakespeare, but nevertheless he remains the characteristic exponent of the English mind. And the more our scholars succeed in making the remote past clear to us, the more we realize how little the fabric of human thought has changed. So, even if there were no possibility of the transmission of a distorted mentality by means of heredity, yet such a mentality could have been transmitted across the ages by the settled mind of humanity and reproduced in each generation. It is evident that a distorted system of thought can be kept in being through the ages, and that the mind of each individual can be affected by it. There is, then, definitely something which may well be called Original Sin, since our minds originate in society, though, perhaps, not from society.

It is, I know, contended that sin is not really a false habit of mind but rather a mere tendency to lapse to a lower state. And it is implied that this is a mere imperfection, a failure of the individual to rise to the general advance. But the facts to which I have appealed shew that the cause, or at all events a cause, for even this comes from outside the individual, and that therefore we need some such term as Original Sin. Whether we should fix a definite point for the beginning of this and call it the Fall is another question. Still it may be pointed out that the story of Eden makes this beginning practically contemporary with the creation of manhood. The difference, then, between the theories of a Fall and a Failure narrows down to a space of time, which is microscopic compared to the length of the history of mankind.

If this theory of the society's being the seat and cause of Original Sin be correct, the belief that Baptism is, or expresses, the remedy for Original Sin is amply justified. For in Baptism the Christian Society, whose atmosphere is purged by Christ, or rather is the Spirit of Christ, takes the person into itself, so that he is subjected to an atmosphere which will conduce to the attainment of a healthy development.

And its effect depends obviously on the extent to which he identifies himself with his new environment.

I am aware that in thus putting the matter I may seem to be quietly slipping away from the beliefs which have been logically derived from the teaching of St. Paul. I do not plead guilty. I have allowed more to heredity than is fashionable. And I have urged the consideration of the influence of what St. Paul would call the Flesh and St. John the World, the complex of wrong thought which is maintained in humanity. But now, in any case, I wish to devote myself to a study of St. Paul's actual statements.

Most of us remember a tradition in which the idea of the Fall dominated men's thoughts not only concerning the period preceding the Crucifixion, but about the subsequent work of Christ. We can still remember the surprise with which we realized that there was no reference to the Fall in any other part of the Old Testament or in the Gospels. The Old Testament writers were quite clear that man is sinful, and ought not to have been, but they did not mention the Fall in Eden as the cause of this trouble. Undoubtedly, the writers between the Old and New Testaments came to lay a certain stress on Adam's sin as the cause. But this only makes the absence of any allusion in the Gospels and the Acts the more striking.

Undoubtedly, the prominence of the Fall in later theology has arisen from St. Paul's references to the sin of Adam. But, even at that, we have yet to realize how bald and scanty St. Paul's references are. Considering the size of the theological structures which have been raised on them, the references in St. Paul to the story of Eden are astonishingly few and slight. There is no reference at all to that central feature, the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, nor to the Tree of Life, nor to the Curse, nor to the Expulsion. Strangest of all, there is no reference to the seed which is to bruise the serpent's head. As to the number of references, the total in the whole of the Pauline epistles is only five, even if we include the doubtful reference in Rom. xvi. 20, "The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly." If the subject had occupied any prominent place in St. Paul's thoughts, surely he would have made some mention of the Second Adam in framing this remark, especially as it occurs at the conclusion of the very epistle in which the all-important passage is found. Two of the references are fragmentary and passing—viz., 2 Cor. xi. 3, "As the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtility," and 1 Tim. ii. 13, 14, 15a, "Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived,* but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. Notwith-

* This would seem to suggest that Eve's sin, and not Adam's, was the real cause.

standing she shall be saved in childbearing." The statement in 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22 is fuller and more apposite. "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Besides these there is only the classical passage, Rom. v. 12-21, on which, really, all hangs, or at least has been hung.

That passage is too long to quote here, and indeed is too familiar to need quotation. Its main assertion is that sin entered into the world through one man, spreading to all, and that similarly through the one Christ grace and life came to all. But even here there is no discussion or suggestion about the manner of the spreading of sin. Indeed, the remark that "sin entered into the world and death through sin, and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned," seems to transfer the blame to the community, and to indicate that sin's continuance was due to the community's own choice rather than an inevitable fate. At all events it leaves it open to us to credit St. Paul with the belief that though Adam opened the door to sin, its continuance was due to other men. As I have said, no suggestion is made as to how the result was transmitted. We may form conjectures for ourselves, but must remember that they are our own conjectures. If, on analysis of the facts of experience, a man comes to the conclusion that he has an innate tendency to sin, or incapacity to do right, no doubt he has a right to conclude that this is part of his personal constitution. But I think it would still be doubtful whether it was inherited or was the product of his environment. In any case, this theory of an hereditary incapacity or taint cannot be proved by any "certain warrant of Holy Scripture" and therefore cannot be held as part of the Faith. It may be held as a "pious opinion," but it must be with caution.

As I have said, the idea is not necessarily contrary to what we know about our physical nature—that atrophied or degenerate organ which we call the appendix has afforded some of us a painful analogy. At the same time, if the general Christian dislike to Traducianism (the belief that one soul is begotten of another) is well founded, we must view any theory of spiritual heredity with deep suspicion.

The statement in 1 Cor. xv. 22, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," needs fuller consideration, especially as it is the occasion of the title, the Second Adam. It is to be observed that the phrases "in Adam" and "in Christ" are parallel, and also that the tense of "all die" (present) indicates a present state of things and not a past action, while that of "shall all be made alive" indicates a state which is in process of formation or becoming. We must try here to

understand and recollect St. Paul's way of thinking, which is very different from ours. To take a specific example, though he refers to his nation sometimes as the Jews, he refers to them quite as commonly as Israel. We are rather apt to forget that Israel is the name of a particular individual, perhaps because we more commonly use the name Jacob for him. But Israel was a man, and a man so named because he was the father of the nation (Gen. xxxv. 10, 11). And though for the most part the name Jacob is retained in the narrative of Genesis, yet in the final scene in which he blesses the tribes under the guise of his sons, the name Israel predominates. To St. Paul, the Jews did not consist of different generations, they were one organism, given its distinctive character by its founder and owing its existence to him. His life was continued in theirs. Their most exact description was his name. This way of regarding human society as an organism is characteristic of St. Paul and finds its perfect expression in his exposition of the life of the Body of Christ. To be "in Christ" is to be a member of the organism which is sometimes regarded as being a Body of which He is the Head, and sometimes as forming a complete Body for Him. But in the passage (1 Cor. xv. 22 ff.) to which we are referring, though Christ is spoken of as the Sphere in which all shall live, yet in the same breath Paul speaks of Him separately as the firstfruits—*i.e.*, the beginning of the New Order. Christ is the beginning of the new society, but as the society continues it is identified with Him. The parallelism of "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" would suggest that St. Paul uses the term Adam to imply a similar combination of ideas. After all, "the word Adam is originally a common noun, denoting either a human being, Gen. ii. 5 . . . or mankind collectively, Gen. i. 26" (Bennett in *H.D.*). That this double use of Adam as a proper and as a common noun was present to St. Paul's mind, is confirmed by "first man Adam" and the "last Adam" of verse 45 becoming the "first man" and the "second man" of verse 47. I therefore venture to suggest that in the phrase, "as in Adam all die," we have, so to speak, the second member of the usage with regard to Israel and Christ, the idea of a social organism, or, if you will, a spiritual complex. Adam would mean alienated humanity. The present tense of the verb in "as in Adam all die" would thus be amply justified. To speak in this way is to give a wider meaning to both the terms, Adam and the Second Adam, than has been customary. But it is to treat St. Paul's thought as consistent, and not, as has been so often done, to look on it as spasmodic. Moreover, it does not throw us back on to a difficult document, but sets us on to consider that accessible field of human life which the

inspiration and insight of St. Paul has surveyed and mapped out for us, so that we can discern the works and ways of God and man to our own soul's profit.

Part of our human environment tends to atrophy us, but part of our environment renews our life. On one hand society has stiffened itself along lines which cramp the soul, on the other society, or at all events part of it, is contrived to give the soul room and power to expand. Such at least were the conclusions which St. Paul formed. Though its organization might be loose, yet sin appeared to him as an organism. It had its principalities and powers. And it had its character, which dated from a remote past. We, of these latter days, have thought so much about the variations of human thought, that we are inclined to overlook its settled consistencies. We have thought so much of our differences from the past, that we fail to realize our continuity with the past. As a corrective, let me give an illustration which may give us furiously to think. To large numbers of Scotsmen, an eel is a "serpent," and the very idea of eating an eel is abhorrent to them. I have known a place and a time when people starved rather than eat them. No reason is given for the name, or explanation for the horror with which the eating of eels is regarded. The reason, for a reason there must have been at one time, must lie in a remote past, to have been so completely forgotten. It does not seem hazardous to guess that the origin of this mental attitude must go back to the days of serpent worship. Those days are, obviously, very long ago. Yet the frame of mind remains, and becomes the natural response of large numbers of people to any suggestion that eels might be used as food.

Now if one were to cross-examine such a Scotsman, or he were to cross-examine himself, this prejudice would appear to be an essential part of his mental make-up, and to be innate. If he should come to live among people who had not this prejudice, and he were to overcome it, yet it would continue to assert itself within him. This example is all the more significant, because it has no moral implications, and shews how a mental environment can persist through long ages, causing a particular adjustment in each individual, even after long ages have elapsed.

Now I venture to suggest that St. Paul was thinking of such facts as these, rather than what we should call the problem of heredity. His attention was continually occupied by the problems of environment. His remedy for the perils of an evil environment was the being taken into a new environment, Christ. This has a practical importance as explaining what becoming a Christian really means. But it has a further

importance in removing a terrible nightmare. So long as I regard my character as self-produced I am puzzled, and indeed appalled, to find the hold which certain sins have upon me, and the way in which they reassert themselves. But if I can realize that they are the product of an environment stabilized by long usage, their force ceases to be inexplicable, and I cease to be bewildered. Moreover, they no longer appear as an essential part of myself. Also, instead of resorting to a single-handed crusade, the very nature of my trouble forces me to avail myself of that other environment, to which I have access in Christ. Besides all this, I am not entirely subject to my environment, but am one of its makers. My struggle with myself, therefore, becomes a struggle to affect other people and to benefit them. Since we are penetrated by our environment, since our spiritual environment works its way into the most secret recesses of our spirits, our most secret and private wrestlings are wrestlings with that environment. Any success, therefore, however small, affects our whole environment. It is a social benefit. In bearing this pressure which makes itself felt within us, we are bearing a common burden, we are bearing the sins of others. And in bringing Christ to bear on ourselves, we are bringing Him to bear on the whole fabric of humanity. No man liveth to himself and no man dieth to himself. We are not self-contained beings, each trying to secure well-being for himself in the seclusion of his own soul, but are social beings taking a hand in securing the well-being of a whole world. Our disputes within ourselves are no petty squabbles, they are the endeavour to secure the triumph of the new environment over the old, outside ourselves as well as within.

But we must recollect that, whereas in thinking of our mental and spiritual environment we think of it as consisting of ideas, St. Paul, with a stricter regard for facts, thought of it as consisting of persons. Nor did he—and the writer of Hebrews strongly supports him—limit our effective environment to those persons who are at present on earth. Our environment is Christ, and He includes in the sphere of His reconciliatory action “all things in the heavens and earth.”

Whoever, therefore, exists, whether he appears on the present stage of history or has disappeared from it, forms part of the field in which Christ is operating. This thought is the basis of St. Paul's hope that “all Israel may be saved” and that God will reconcile all to Himself through Christ. And once again we are brought back from mere speculation to an indication of facts which we can detect and scrutinize. For among the influences which exert their pressure on a man's heart, some of the most powerful come from persons who have departed this

life. There is more at work than memory and much more than our reflections on our recollections of our friends.

It is personal influence, of a mixed character, good in part and perverse in part, the very mixture often indicating the person from whom it comes. But if influence can be exerted one way, it can be exerted the other. The path is evidently open. The very existence, therefore, of this current of force, which is a characteristic portion of that mass of influence, which has come to be called Original Sin, loses the character of a mere legacy. It is the indication of a living relation, and therefore of an opportunity. For it means nothing less than that we can be the means of influencing those who are thus influencing us. So far as we allow ourselves to be charged with the current of divine grace, it will flow out along that line to them and take its effect on them. So we have an opportunity of repaying what we have gained through them, by aiding them to have their deficiencies supplied and the errors of their past retrieved.

R. O. P. TAYLOR.

THE JEWISH KINGSHIP AND THE SACRED COMBAT

OLD Testament scholars of reputation and ability are introducing the English-speaking world to theories of the Jewish Kingship, which have been worked out abroad by men like Mowinckel, H. Schmidt and Graf Baudissin. We are encouraged to associate it as closely as possible with the circle of ideas about Eastern Kings which have been long familiar to us from the researches of Fraser. Much has been done in recent years to illustrate and expand such theories by criticism and archæology. The group of students in London who have produced *Myth and Ritual*, and more recently *The Labyrinth*, are occupied in proving that David on the conquest of Jerusalem "found in the Jebusite cultus with its High God Elyon, and its royal-priestly order of Malki-sedek, a valuable means of emphasizing the ideal unity of his Kingdom." In short, Jahweh becomes Elyon, and the Davidic King "Priest after the order of Malki-sedek," and we must expect to find sufficient evidence in the Jewish documents to attest these facts.

If these theories are more than speculation, we shall understand that when Israel demanded a King she associated with the idea of Monarchy what other nations associated with it. This

was far more than the desire to have one to lead the people in war, to negotiate with the heads of other states, to guide the internal affairs of the nation, and to give individual judgements at the gates of the city; it was the desire to have the same religious personality, the same quasi-Incarnation of the Divine that Egypt or Babylonia claimed intimately blended with their national life. Such a King would represent the Deity as his Son, and would be capable, if proper ritual were followed, of influencing the forces of nature for the benefit of the nation. It is a truism that there was throughout the East what is called by students a "pattern" of representative ritual in which the King went through a mock-drama—possibly the heir and successor of a real drama—in which he was attacked, humiliated, and even appeared to die, only to rise again in fresh vigour hailed by the songs of his people. Such a drama insured the fertility of the land at the turn of the year. For the King was understood to represent, or even to be, the God, when he came in procession from some sacred well through a labyrinthine way to the Temple, went through a combat with mock-foes, simulated exhaustion, surrender and death, and then in resurrection and triumph recited the bitter experiences of humiliation and the joy of life regained. Then he would be borne up to his throne, and the ceremony of a mock-marriage would follow.

It is now supposed that Solomon's Temple was the yearly scene of a drama of this nature, the Davidic King being the central actor. It is suggested that it was the real *motif* of the Feast of Tabernacles, the autumn festival of the turn of the year, and that it had a connection with Sun-worship.

Those to whom these theories are not attractive will no doubt be ready to admit that Egyptian and Babylonian notions of Kingship affected Jewish notions in some degree; it would be strange if this were not the case. But that this went beyond vague sentiment and forms of speech in alluding to the monarch will be considered to require stronger proof than is yet afforded. The historical books give little but the vaguest hints that such views of the King ever passed out of the sphere of sentiment into that of organized ritual practice.

The story of the Kings of Israel and Judah rests to a large extent on contemporary records of an official character. That the books containing it went through drastic re-editing after the return from exile and the setting-up of the priestly state is beyond doubt, but such re-editing must have been drastic indeed, and directed in a way one would hardly have expected, if it eliminated so completely the references to important elements of the life of the nation of yearly recurrence, which the original chroniclers could hardly have abstained from re-

ording. There are, of course, allusions to the value to the state of the preservation of the King's life in Eastern phraseology: David is "the Lamp of Israel," and the Kings are "the anointed of Jahveh," but we cannot read between the lines of the elaborate accounts of the yearly feasts any dim record of a ritual combat. It is as hard to detect such references as to obliterate the constant presence of the chroniclers' detestation of the recrudescence of fertility cults.

Jewish Prophecy arose in the eighth century, and flourished till the exile and return; though there was much arrangement and grouping of individual utterances, and though the ascription of certain passages to an individual prophet are sometimes hazardous, it may be assumed that the actual utterances were sacrosanct and must not be tampered with; yet any vague allusion to a national ritual of the kind suggested is hard to find. When Jeremiah (viii. 19) complains "The harvest is past, the ingathering is ended, and we are not saved," and asks, "Is not the Lord in Zion? Is not her King in her," it is not impossible that he is bewailing in the downfall of the Monarchy the loss of Israel's yearly pledge of fertility or salvation, but to one not trying to defend a thesis it reads rather as a metaphorical expression of despair. Again another passage (Zech. ix. 9) pictures the future King as "just and having salvation; lowly and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass"; it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the anointed one riding on an ass may be a memory of the humiliation of the King in the ritual drama of days long past in the prophet's time, but there seems a greater likelihood that it is an anticipation of a pacific rule dimly foreseen in the future, like Vergil's of the Fourth Eclogue.

But it is conceivable that the long roll of Jewish prophets, with their respect for the King's office, with their dislike of fertility cults, and their strong sense of the ethical values of the religion they were divinely called to teach, should never have mentioned in plain terms what they must have considered shocking adventures in religious syncretism.

The supposed drama is associated with the Feast of Tabernacles, the most important of the Jewish Feasts, and the one that occurred latest, at the turn of the year. Its institution is recorded in Leviticus (xxiii.), Numbers (xxviii.), and Deuteronomy (xvi.). These accounts (even if they are not of Mosaic origin) embody the most ancient notions of the Jewish priesthood about the rites they conducted, which apparently were of the nature of a harvest festival. It may be granted that they underwent re-editing and adaptation for the Church-State after the exile; but it is difficult to suppose that such coherent accounts ever

contained allusions to what according to the new theories must have been the dominant thought of the day. If there was adaptation at all, is it not more likely that a merely agricultural feast was adapted to refer to the delivery from Egypt? It is difficult to suppose that the central ideas of the Feast were eliminated so completely, and others substituted. It is argued that Jeroboam, when he rebelled and instituted a rival monarchy in the north, took care to transplant the festival in which the oneness of King and people was expressed to Beth-el. As a matter of fact he did institute a feast—or possibly officially recognize what was already in existence there. But though he is represented in 1 Kings xii. 26-33 as himself “sacrificing to the calves which he had made,” and “going up to the altar at Beth-el and offering incense,” there is nothing in the record that suggests any connection of the Kingship that he had assumed being associated with a ritual cult of fertility. One would have expected that if there was such an association, such an invasion of the supposed Davidic rights would have been represented as the head and crown of his offending. It is true that his new festival was to be held on the same date as the Feast of Tabernacles, “the fifteenth day of the eighth month,” but he would naturally choose the immemorial date that marked the end of the year’s work, and had been held sacred long before Israel had a King at all. Religion had to be centralized in the Northern Kingdom, and this could best be done by recognizing Beth-el, a very ancient sacred place; the minds of his people were thus recalled to the value of their own natural religious centre. It is all told us from the angle from which the later editor viewed it, when the limitation of sacrifice to Jerusalem had become a fact and sacrifice at the ancient high places no longer allowed. The point of view was very different in Jeroboam’s day.

Not only in this instance but throughout the history of the Kings we are called to believe that the fifth-century revisers designedly and systematically cut out every possible allusion to the culminating point of the year’s cultus. Is it not hard to credit that this could have been done so effectually, and that the memory of its existence should have been so completely extinguished?

But it will be answered that the Psalms are full of references to the ritual combat of the Feast of Tabernacles, allusions which are difficult to interpret on any other hypothesis than that they were intended to be used on that one occasion. The Psalms are undoubtedly the chief support of the new theories; in fairness it must be admitted that if these theories could be solidly based on history, the Psalms would be a valuable adjunct

to their support, and afford a series of valuable illustrations. We should have to throw back the date of many parts of this hymn-book of the second Temple to the days of the earlier Kings; but modern scholarship on other grounds is inclined to give earlier dates to the Psalms than scholars gave in the last century. Then their applicability to the various stages of the ritual of the religious combat, or "pattern" as it is technically called, would be perceived. This has been done in a very convincing way; hymns can be selected which correspond well with what was done in the fertility ritual of other nations, so far as its nature is known. Many hard places in the Psalms can be explained and interpreted on the basis of the religious combat theory. We have a series of hymns suited to a procession bringing water from a sacred spring up to Mount Zion, songs of welcome inspired by a sense of a special manifestation of the Divine presence; we have songs that dwell on the fertility of land and farmyard, depending on the worship of the sanctuary and the right condition of human hearts; there are personal lyrics in a minor key expressing the emotion of one borne down by overwhelming disaster, or conquered and humiliated by bitter foes: then after a descent to the gates of death rise songs of joyous revival, triumph, and unexpected victory. There is one ode that might herald the ceremony of a sacred marriage year by year, telling of a King's daughter in raiment of needlework with apparel of bright gold brought with joy and gladness to the King's palace. From such songs it is possible to reconstruct with an appearance of verisimilitude the various stages of the so-called pattern of the ritual of the sacred royal combat; from the Psalms "the book of the words" of the drama can be disinterred; swept away from history its memory has lingered on in song; these lyrics of the sacred Davidic monarchy remained for the choristers of the Second Temple to sing, though the Kings had passed away.

Yes. Selected Psalms make the hypothesis seem probable. But there are other considerations to be taken into account. There may be little doubt that such selections accord well with the situations assigned them in the ritual drama, but if they are to be regarded as the mainstay of the theory, we ought to inquire how far they *necessarily* suggest the ritual that is assumed on their own evidence to be their source and origin. We must not forget that hitherto scholarship has given more or less adequate explanations of their nature and origin, even though individual scholars have not always been in agreement.

But it is important to remember that the so-called "pattern" of Eastern ritual is not a pattern dissimilar from the pattern of human life, as viewed by Eastern thought. Outside the ritual,

as well as within its mystic circle, there are common and normal ideas germane to all poetical expression; such are the assurance of the Divine presence in response to worship, confidence in the giver of daily bread, life itself precarious and feeble, subject to sickness even to the gates of death, recovery of health and victory over circumstances, bitter conflicts with external forces human or dæmonic, defeat transformed by patience and the conviction of the Divine help into victory and safety. Are not these the stuff out of which human life is made, the familiar if mysterious web of which it is woven whether for the individual or for the nation?

May it not be that it is because the Psalms are such a complete commentary on this life-rhythm that they occupy the place they do in the affection of all who think seriously of the meaning of life? That is why they passed so easily from the Jewish Temple to the Christian Church, and thence into the heart of the world. If it is conceivable that they were originally evolved from the restricted area of a symbolic royal combat, at any rate it is certain that they have been applied for many generations to the larger spheres of normal human life. If we think that some of them *might* express the sentimental ebb and flow of a mock-drama, we can be absolutely certain that they *do* express the constantly recurring feelings and aspirations, doubts, hopes and fears of all human beings.

We must then take into account the fact that the ritual drama of Egypt and Babylonia ran very close, though it had a special object, to the ordinary course of human life and its attitude to the forces outside itself, and on the other hand that there is in the Psalter a very complete expression of man's reaction to all the impressions that life makes upon him. It is not to be assumed too hastily that the one commentary has any necessary connection with the other, however striking the appearance of identity in sentiment and practical suitability may be.

A writer in *The Labyrinth* refers to the Bible Apocalypse as preserving the ancient pattern of the sacred combat. In it he notes the rhythm of movement, combat, apparent conquest, revival and the religious marriage of the King, carried to its ideal and universal culmination in the "marriage-supper of the Lamb." Must we suppose that these ideas lay dormant in the Jewish consciousness, shewing a fitful life from time to time in the Jewish Apocalypses, until they at last blossomed once more in St. John the Divine? Are they, that is to say, racial memories of what once actually was done in Solomon's Temple?

It is much more natural to suppose that the Apocalyptic

writers were throughout their course subject to extensive influence from Egypt and Babylonia, where these ideas were dominant in religious thought and practice.

May we conclude that the new theories have a natural fascination and enticement for those who would connect Hebrew and ethic religious rites, but that at present the grounds on which they rest are scarcely solid enough to assure our tread ?

W. J. FERRAR.

FOUR KINGS

GRAY with the elder lore that still foreknew
The things that shall be through the things that are
In pale script runed on night's enfolding blue,
Stars—and a Star,

Three came by long, slow leagues of sand and stone,
Foot-weary, pursuant, aflame to bring
Joint-vassalage to One who reigned alone,
Kings—and a King.

Ophir and Araby and far Cathay;
Gold gleams, myrrh breathes, frankincense—tendrils lift
Thin, fragrant holiness; men meekly pray—
Gifts—and a Gift.

"Ancilla Domini, Maid unabhor'd,
White earthly fount of God's Nativity,
Deny us not of this thy tiny Lord
Epiphany."

"Dim in the shining of a stable light,
Breast-fast, acclaim him King this morn of morns;
Hail him again, Tree-fast, through noonday night,
Crown'd, but with thorns."

S. C. C.

MISCELLANEA

THESES

OUTLINING THE NECESSARY PROLEGOMENA OF THEOLOGICAL UNITY IN OUR DAY ON AN EVANGELICAL-CATHOLIC BASIS

1. Revelation is not propositional—that is, it is not the communication to us by God of information, but a revealing by God of *Himself*, by shewing in action what He is.

2. Hence, in endeavouring to found doctrines on the Bible, we must be continually referring back from the text of the Bible to the acts of God which lie behind it. Similarly, the formulated doctrines of the Church only carry authority in so far as it appears that they are legitimate interpretations of these same acts of God.

3. This emphasis on the act of God, which must be the foundation principle of the theology of the future, throws up into the highest relief God's unique and supreme act "for us men and for our salvation" in and through our Lord Jesus Christ—an act which, while by no means *confined* to the death of Christ, yet reaches its determinative crisis in the Cross. The experienced delivery of the first Christians both from the guilt and, in large and increasing measure, from the power of sin precisely through the sacrifice of the death of Christ forms no small part of the total act of God of which the New Testament is the record—though no precise *explanation* of the efficacy of the Cross can be held to be binding.

4. The redemptive efficacy of the Cross—"the Atonement," in short—is self-evidencing; its power and spiritual validity are evident throughout the Christian ages, and (when rightly understood) it majestically commands the unsophisticated conscience of the normal man today. This is the supreme certainty of Christianity, it is this which possesses the most unqualified authority. It must be at once the foundation, the centre, and the touchstone of the theology of the coming time.

5. The foregoing means that the whole earthly manifestation, including the Resurrection, of our Lord Jesus Christ is truly and directly an act of God; and this, in turn, involves the whole substance, at least, of the traditional doctrine of the Incarnation.

6. The special outpouring of the Holy Spirit of God, bound up, in the most intimate manner, with the life, death, and rising again of Jesus Christ, is likewise an integral part of the same total act of God. Thus God has shown Himself in action as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—implying, in some sort, a threefoldness in His Being, such as it has been sought to express, in a reasoned manner, in the Church-doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

7. The sense of acceptance with God, together with the power of a new life, through the Cross of Christ was inseparable for the first Christians from the consciousness of having been planted by God into a society, the mystical Body of His Son. The formation of such a society as the direct result of our Lord's earthly career is a sheer fact, and, on any view possible for a professing Christian, must have been the veritable act of God. Further, the inseparability of the highest knowledge of God previously made known on earth from the Church-nation of Israel, recognized as, in a special sense, the people of God, is equally a sheer and undeniable fact. The Christian Church is necessarily regarded in

the New Testament as a reconstitution of the old Church-nation—as, in fact, the true, spiritual Israel of God.

8. The spiritual life of the Christian is, normally at least, nourished within the Church; he grows to his best by living the life of the Church. This, being no mere aggregate but an organic collectivity of personal life, is eminently adapted to be a medium of God's personal influence on and in the soul (*i.e.* His "grace").

9. The recognition of the indispensability of the visible Church carries with it the acceptance of the two Sacraments of the Gospel. Shelving the question of their actual Dominical institution, which (whether reasonably or unreasonably) is widely disputed, at any rate they were universally observed from the first in the Church; they formed an integral part of the *de facto* method of God's constitutive act in re-forming His Church. Further, the naturalness of a solemn rite of initiation and of a standing symbol of union and central act of worship is obvious.

10. The redemptive act of God continues; by a permanent activity, founded on the original accomplished redemption through our Lord Jesus Christ, He continually applies that redemption to our souls and makes it effective in them. This action of His cannot, of course, be confined to any outward "means of grace," but is constantly available to be appropriated by faith. Yet the sacraments must be regarded as special occasions on and through which He acts. Hence their symbolism should be regarded as one of actions rather than of objects, and, further, they cannot be regarded as only symbols, but must be acknowledged to be also, in some sort, instruments.

11. The recognition of a real and momentous act of God as the origin of the Christian Church must needs make us attach a very high value to historical continuity. On this ground alone (whatever weight we may or may not attach to other claims sometimes made for the institution) episcopacy, as the form of Church government and of the transmission of ministerial authority which is far more deeply rooted in Church history as a whole than any of its rivals, may well be held to have a prerogative claim.

N. E. EGERTON SWANN.

CORRESPONDENCE

ADVENT

DEAR SIR,

Is Blunt wrong, then, when he says in *Annotated Book of Common Prayer* (1888) that the *name* Advent can be traced back no further than the seventh century, but "Collect, Epistles, and Gospels for five Sundays before the Nativity of our Lord and for the Wednesdays and Fridays also are to be found in the ancient Sacramentaries and in the 'Comes' of St. Jerome"?

He is, if what *Liturgy and Worship* says is right (p. 211), namely that "*Advent* as a preparation for Christmas seems to have originated in Gaul in the sixth century." And this you apparently follow in your note: "*Advent* dates only from the sixth century."

Advent as a *name*, Blunt says (*Liturgy and Worship*), Advent as a *season*, dates from the sixth (seventh) century. Which is right?

Yours faithfully,

G. H. HARRIS.

REVIEWS

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH. By Sergius Bulgakov. Centenary Press. 8s. 6d.

This work is an authoritative statement of the theological standpoint of the Orthodox Church which is of first-rate importance. Professor Bulgakov is the greatest living Russian theologian, and he has done a timely service in giving us this book in English. The teaching and practice of the Orthodox Church are so much misunderstood that we welcome this volume from one who speaks with first-hand knowledge. The first half of the book is taken up with expositions on the Church and tradition, the Hierarchy, the Unity and Sanctity of the Church. Chapter i. opens with the statement that "Orthodoxy is the Church of Christ on earth." And a little later, "not the whole of the human race belongs to the Church, only the elect. And not all Christians belong, in the fullest sense, to the Church—only Orthodox." We are familiar with such a statement in a work on Orthodoxy. At first sight it is felt to be like the Roman dictum *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* and rather an over-statement; the reader must continue and he will find the interpretation later. Professor Zankov has told us* that there are two parallel opinions with regard to the place of non-orthodox churches in the one Church of Christ. One opinion holds that only the Orthodox is *the* Church and that all others have fallen away from it. The other opinion (which is Zankov's own) holds that the Orthodox Church is the Church of Christ, but that the great historical non-Orthodox churches are not to be considered as completely fallen away or separated from the Church of Christ. Bulgakov agrees with this second view, for in chapter xvii. he says: "The Orthodox Church possesses the plenitude and purity of the truth in the Holy Spirit, hence the desire to make all the Christian world orthodox." That is the logic of the situation, for the truth cannot be measured by half-truths. He proceeds thus: "The Christian world should become Orthodox; but what does this mean? Does it mean that everyone should become a member of a certain church organization? There does not exist in Orthodoxy a single ecclesiastical organization which could be entered; the Orthodox Church is a system of national, autocephalous churches allied to one another." There we have a broader view which gives hope for a closer approach on the part of Orthodoxy to the Anglican Church. When the writer deals with reunion, he makes it clear that reunion can come only when there is a dogmatic agreement between the Churches. This is a

* "The Eastern Orthodox Church."

sound principle, for a federation of Churches, who are at variance on fundamentals, will not lead to a true unity. "Only an agreement between the Churches, founded on the maximum of their common inheritance, can lead the Christian world to real union. This maximum is Orthodoxy."

In dealing with Holy Scripture, Bulgakov places the authority of the Church as the true support for the Bible. "Scripture and tradition belong to the one life of the Church moved by the same Holy Spirit, which operates in the Church, manifesting itself in tradition and inspiring sacred writers." He calls the Reformers to witness inasmuch as they received the Bible from the Church, that is by tradition. There is a generous acknowledgment of the scientific study of the Bible by Anglicans and other students. "The Orthodox consciousness has neither to fear nor to be disturbed by Biblical criticism, for, by means of that criticism, there is gained a more exact idea of the ways of God and the action of the Holy Spirit." Orthodox Biblical science began to develop in Russia in the nineteenth century; it is still in its infancy, and we watch its results with interest.

There is an attractive chapter on "Icons and their Cult," which all who are puzzled by the popularity of these fascinating emblems in religious worship in Russia should read. The icon recalls the soul to the presence of God. It represents incidents in the life of Christ, or of the Blessed Virgin, or the Saints. Icons are religious truths in picture and their use lies in religious psychology. They promote spiritual contemplation by giving a vision of God to the soul. Iconography as art has its special characteristics. Naturalism and realism are absent. Being of the nature of decorative art, they do not include a third dimension, that is, length and breadth are there, but not depth or thickness. Thus it excludes sensuality, and its symbolism is merely that of form and colour. "The Orthodox prays before the icon of Christ as before Christ Himself; but the icon, the abiding place of the presence, remains only a thing and never becomes an idol or a fetish." There is an interesting account of Orthodox Mysticism, with references to Mystical writers, and an account of the use of the "Prayer of Jesus" as given in the *Philokalia*.

The book concludes with a reference to the crisis through which Orthodoxy is passing brought about by the Russian Revolution. The Russian Church lies beneath the weight of a cruel persecution, but the writer sees in its fiery trial a preparation for a new future. This he faces with hope and courage, for the Orthodox Church believes that the Holy Ghost abides in the Church, and is calling it to a new era of creative Christian life.

F. N. HEAZELL.

RECONSTRUCTIONS OF EARLY CHRISTIAN DOCUMENTS. Vol. I.

By the Rev. H. J. Bardsley. S.P.C.K. Pp. 454. 15s.

The task undertaken by Mr. Bardsley is the extraction of serious information on Christian origins from the mass of pseudo-Apostolic Acts, Gospels etc., which began to accumulate in the second century. In dealing with this vast and chaotic literature he employs four canons of criticism, which he assumes and which had better be stated in his own words:

(1) "No apocryphist whose work either survives or underlies existing documents was capable of inventing a statement purporting to be historical which would possess any vraisemblance for a modern scholar." (2) "The fundamental depravations of the primary apocryphal Acts, the 'Preaching of Peter,' were due to doctrinal motives which can be determined." (3) "The secondary apocryphists hardly ever invent; they quarry, pervert and retessellate." (4) "The interrelations of the extant apocrypha are the relations of the sources of Hegesippus."

These "sources of Hegesippus" the author detects as follows: (1) The "Preaching of Peter" (cited as KP) derived from the sources of I Acts, a Cæsarean manual, and from that source of the canonical Gospel of Matthew which Streeter terms M. (2) The "Steps of James" (J) derived from KP and tradition. (3) The "Preaching of Paul" (QPl) derived from M, KP, J, John, Acts. (4) The "Acts of Peter" (QP) derived from KP and QPl. (5) The "Ebionite Romance" from J, QP, Papias. (6) The Leucian "Acts of John," derived from Papias, QPl and QP. (7) The "Acts of the Desposyni" (QDesp) derived from QPl and tradition.

Mr. Bardsley defines with precision the *tendency* and historical setting of each of these documents and, within reasonably narrow limits, their dates. The *known* fragments of Hegesippus would occupy roughly one hundred lines of an ordinary codex (about 7 lines from Books I.-IV. of his five Books and the rest from Book V.). When it is added that of these seven sources only No. 6 now exists complete (probably not in the original form), that none of the others is now known save in exiguous fragmentary quotations, and that every document symbolized above with Q is a hypothetical entity recovered only by critical intuition from the existing fragments of lost documents, the nature of this enquiry becomes plain.

Stated crudely, Mr. Bardsley's method is as follows: By comparison of later (sometimes much later) apocryphal documents he reconstitutes (lost) sections of Hegesippus' *Memoirs*. He then analyzes Hegesippus so recovered into his seven (lost) sources. He then analyzes these (lost) sources into their (lost) under-sources, of which he lays bare the prepossessions and

imperfectly concealed bias. Finally, from the early information thus obtained he corrects the erroneous and misleading statements of the first-century documents now contained in the Christian N.T. This is, I admit, an inadequate simplification of the method employed. There are numerous complications in the shape of later "depravations," postulated lost documents between extant apocrypha and Hegesippus, abbreviated editions of the latter, etc., but this is the simple outline of the plan.

Mr. Bardsley opens with a list of one hundred and fifteen abbreviations, which unfortunately by no means contains all those which are used in the body of the work. A few sentences taken at random will illustrate the peculiar difficulty of reviewing the work. P. 219: "A few sentences in the very late matter printed in *Woodbrooke Studies* III. suggest that EP and EPI have undergone abbreviation in transmission. While this document in 368 agrees with the serious depravation of QEPP in EP 20, it is in several places superior to EP: (a) perhaps in the allusion to unclean meats (316, EP, 479), (b) in *Aradus* (370, EP, 483). (c) In 382 Stephen is Paul's nephew. (In RSteph 161 he is of the tribe of Benjamin.) EP and EPI have no apocryphal matter about Stephen. Our late document, in view of the allusion in RSteph, probably derives from a passage of Heg. which preceded his account of the conversion of the Apostle used in EPL 534. (d) 382 probably preserves QEPP in the statement of Paul that he will preach with Peter and John: EP 495 omits. In 396 Paul practises idolatry at Rome and the Emperor consults him. (§ 240 L) EP 495 transfers the incident to Antioch." Many of the pages are far more algebraical than this; the result is that the unfortunate reader either has to do this exceedingly complicated piece of research all over again for himself or abandon the book in despair. In this particular passage Mr. Bardsley is dealing with an Ethiopic MS. of the seventeenth century containing the "Contendings of Peter and Paul." This is a translation of an Arabic version of a Coptic version of a (? Greek) document, which Mr. Bardsley (on very slight grounds) assigns to the age of Mohammed. This, he maintains, derives from, partially "depraves" and abbreviates, a lost document he calls QEPP, which in turn abbreviates a passage of Hegesippus' *Memoirs*. The situation is further complicated by the conjecture that Hegesippus himself "broke up his narrative into sections and introduced into each section the matter which referred to it in his various sources." However, from this seventeenth-century copy of a version of a version of a version of (? a version of) an expansion of a lost document which derived from, "depraved" and abbreviated, a lost document which rearranged its (lost) sources, Mr. Bardsley

succeeds here in (p. 214) assigning to the said various (lost) sources of Hegesippus large sections of matter from the (lost) "Acts of Peter," the (hypothetical) "Preaching of Paul," the (lost) "Ebionite Romance" and a portion (otherwise unknown) of the (fragmentary) "Preaching of Peter." From these documents thus obtained the canonical Acts of the Apostles can be largely supplemented. The whole chapter has to be very carefully examined to be believed, and it is quite typical of the rest of the book. I may add that after examination of all the documents concerned I am unable to discover any evidence that Hegesippus' work underlies any item in the hypothetical chain.

The "Documents" which chiefly come in for "Reconstruction" are those of the Canonical N.T. Mr. Bardsley puts forward (among others) the following conclusions: (1) That St. Mark wrote "proto-Mark" at Cæsarea in A.D. 37. (2) At the outbreak of the Herodian persecution, a Judaizer (JMk) introduced much Midrashic matter from M of a Judaizing character attacking the Apostles. (3) Shortly afterwards a Gentile (GMk) omitted most of JMk's interpolations, including the Sermon on the Mount, substituting the exegesis of deutero Q, and considerably troubled the order. (4) There is also a pseudo-Mark, whom I take to be Mr. Bardsley's name for the author of the Canonical Gospel of Mark (among the *sources* of which he places the Matthæan M). (5) St. Mark himself originally wrote "proto-Mark" for Theophilus, who was Pilate's successor as Procurator. Later Theophilus was troubled by the various editions of his gospel. Hence the activities of St. Luke, who wrote at Antioch in A.D. 47, but unfortunately tried to combine proto-Luke with proto-Mark and GMk, which confounded matters still further. (6) St. Mark was also the author of two books of "Acts" which everywhere underlie Acts i.-xv., but in which St. Luke (somewhat unscrupulously, if Mr. Bardsley is right) made decisive changes. (7) At the basis of all Gospels lie two documents, X ("not improbably written by a woman") and the Logia by St. Matthew. X was used by St. Mark in proto-Mark, by St. Luke in proto-Luke, by M, by St. John and by the writers of his Midrashim. M was used by JMk, by the author of Lk. i.-ii., by deutero Q, by Matthew, pseudo-Mark, Cerinthus and Leucius. The Logia was used by M and Q. Q was used by St. Luke and deutero Q. Deutero Q by GMk and Matthew. (8) The Fourth Gospel "was the work of a blundering editor who used papers which preserved the oral teaching of St. John." "He had no adequate conception of the importance of truth in the writing of a Gospel." The Apostle can hardly be blamed; he was by then so decrepit that "it is improbable

that he could see to read and not improbable that he was also very deaf." Gaius of Pergamum was chiefly responsible for the foisting upon eighteen centuries of this compost of misplaced fragments, blunders and editorial falsehoods as the supreme interpretation of the Word made Flesh. Vol. ii. has still to follow.

To a somewhat detached observer it is always interesting to notice the practical meaning nowadays attached in the Church of England to the doctrine of the inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures and their exclusive sufficiency as doctrinal sources.

The survival of at least three copies of Hegesippus' *Memoirs* as late as the sixteenth century has been demonstrated by Zahn, a fact which Mr. Bardsley does not mention. It is not impossible that were the work ever recovered we should find that later Eastern writers owed something to it. The fact that Irenæus, Eusebius and Epiphanius in seeking historical matter from it all independently concentrated on the *same* group of passages in Book V. suggests that it contained no other—or little other—obvious historical material. The suggestion that it was in any adequate sense a *history* of the most primitive Church seems to be a *canard* of St. Jerome's, and I know no evidence that he knew of the book more than he found in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius. The recovery of any part of it would be of obvious interest and importance, but rather, I would suggest, for the history and ideas of the second than the first century. The collection of "Apostolic" Documents into an exclusive Canon did not take place before c. A.D. 175-200. This was a genuine attempt to collect all the surviving monuments of the "Apostolic" age (the limit for inclusion seems to have been roughly fixed c. A.D. 95; the Apocalypse, c. A.D. 93, and I Clement, c. A.D. 96, were on the edge for centuries, Ignatius, c. A.D. 115, was not), and the tendency was to include too much rather than too little. Had the abundant early literature postulated by Mr. Bardsley then been in existence, it must have had serious results upon that process. In fact its effect is not anywhere discernible. The theory that right down the centuries the large array of obviously vital historical statements which this book attributes to Hegesippus lay at the disposal of all and sundry and was deliberately ignored by historians like Eusebius who *used* his book presents grave difficulties. The theory that any and every apocryphist reproduced Hegesippus at first, second, third or fourth hand, and always with sufficient fidelity for the underlying (and shuffled) sources of Hegesippus himself to be now accurately discernible, seems beyond measure gratuitous.

GREGORY DIX, O.S.B.

NOTICES

THE CLOSER WALK WITH GOD. By Ælfrida Tillyard. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. cloth, 2s. 6d. paper.

The deepening of the life of prayer and devotion is increasingly coming to be seen as the solution of most of our problems in Church life. Is a congregation lukewarm about missions? Often it will be found that its devotional level is poor. Is there faction and conflict? Frequently it will be discovered that the prayer-life is shallow. Consequently anything which will help worshippers to make progress in their spiritual life deserves welcome. This little book, written in popular and straightforward language, is calculated to do much good. (Borrowing an irritating trick from the author, may we complain of the abundance of parenthesis? These asides disfigure almost every page.)

The method adopted, that of intimate talks with the reader rather than formal chapters, will repel some, but will doubtless commend the book to many. The chapter on "Solitude" is one of the best in the book, while that on "Companionship" should help the reader to grasp the importance of the practice, as well as the doctrine, of the Communion of Saints.

What kind of readers will be attracted by this book? We imagine that the author has in mind chiefly those unversed in the classics of meditation, the "Ignatian Exercises," "Spiritual Combat," etc. Then would it not be as well to give them some vehicles for their aspirations? Prayers, psalms, acts, hymns such as "Jesu dulcis memoria" or "St. Patrick's Breastplate," would have made a useful addition to the chapters, for most people are inarticulate and need the words in which to convey desires and to clarify half-understood emotions. Clergy who recommend this book, as many will surely do, may supply suggestions in this direction.

M. DONAVAN.

THE WAY TO GOD. The Broadcast Talks. 2nd Series. By C. C. Martindale, C. E. Raven, and G. F. Macleod. S.C.M. Press. 3s. 6d.

Father Martindale deals with the life, the death, and the conquest of our Lord. He tells the Gospel story in the vivid, graphic way that we have learned with delight to expect from him. He says of his own lectures that they are meant to be descriptive rather than theological. His intention is to set before us a picture rather than an argument. But there is no mistaking the basis of dogmatic truth that underlies his portrayal. "At the outset I will ask leave to affirm my belief that Jesus Christ, of whom I am to speak and whom we call our 'Lord,' is True Man, True God; the uniquely accredited Spokesman of God to our race in whatsoever period of time or area of space; and the sole Saviour of mankind."

Professor Raven treats of our Lord's power in history and His power and claim to-day. He calls attention to three elements in His influence which go far to establish the Christian claim. First, He gives to men a knowledge which satisfies their deepest longings, and binds them together in a common loyalty. Secondly, He gives them the power of spiritual rebirth. And, thirdly, He brings about the redress of social evil and the reform of human society.

Mr. Macleod's talks are concerned with the issues of faith, with the

effect of faith upon men's conduct—their response to it. To accept the Christian creed is to have an utterly different point of view from that of the natural man, to see the world as Christ sees it, and also to determine every action from His viewpoint. The Christian life is not so much a set of rules of things one must do, still less a list of things one must not do. It is "not merely to refrain from doing what no gentleman would think of doing anyway; but to do those things which would never occur to anyone who had not been touched by the spirit of Jesus Christ."

These talks must have done much good when they were broadcast. And many will be glad to have them in book form.

H. S. Box.

ARBEIT UND SITTE IN PALÄSTINA: IV, BROT, ÖL UND WEIN. By G. Dalman. Verlag Bertelsmann. Gütersloh. M. 24.

The veteran author dedicates this monument of learning and industry to the theological seminary at Herrnhut, where he began his studies sixty years ago. Bread, oil, and wine, the fundamental basis of Syrian life, are here described; a fifth volume will deal with weaving, spinning, clothing, and other sides of domestic life, left out of the previous four volumes. The method used is to take each side of the subject as it appears to-day and then to compare it with what is known of it in antiquity. Thus bread is divided into the following sections: fuel—wood, charcoal, brushwood, husks, dung; lighting methods; baking without ovens and in ovens of various kinds; and confectionery. The modern part is based on a lifelong knowledge of the country, the ancient part on an exhaustive study of the rabbinical material. The reader continually meets remarks which illustrate the Bible. For example, the housewife who keeps her lamp alight all night does so because she intends to begin cooking first thing in the morning without having to tackle the long and tedious process of kindling a fire. The Parable of the Virgins assumes that a lamp once extinguished could not readily be relit. This is just one of the things we tend to forget—what life without matches, or even the developed tinder-box, was like. The dough in Exodus xii. 34 had been prepared overnight for the morrow's baking, according to custom. Perhaps the most interesting part of a monograph never likely to be superseded is the appendix of illustrations, 112 in number, of which No. 7 (a fire of coals for cooking fish by the side of the Lake of Galilee), No. 30 (thirteen different kinds of bread), Nos. 93, 94 (watchtowers in vineyards), and Nos. 97, 98 (treading out the grapes) are particularly attractive.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

STUDIES IN THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL. By John Battersby Harford. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.

At the beginning of the present century almost all scholars took it for granted that the book of Ezekiel was a unity, the work of a single mind. But during the last thirty-five years much criticism has been directed upon its contents. First came the theories, associated with the name of Kraetschmar, Jahn, and Herrmann respectively, that there are two independent recensions of the original material, that scribes and copyists have adapted Ezekiel's message to the needs of later generations, and that the book is a collection of sermon notes, compiled by Ezekiel himself and

added to by later hands, but not chronologically arranged. To none of these theories was much attention paid. It was not until more radical views were expressed that scholars generally became aware of the existence of any serious Ezekielian problems.

In 1924 Hölscher found in Ezekiel two different worlds, that of the prophet and that of a later editor or editors, and left to Ezekiel himself only 143 verses out of 1,272. In 1930 and 1931, independently of each other, Torrey and James Smith advanced the theory that Ezekiel's prophecies had their setting, not in Babylonia, but in Palestine. Finally, in 1932 Herntrich declared in favour of two prophets, one speaking in person to the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem, the other, who lived and taught during the Exile, providing the Babylonian framework of the book.

Canon Battersby Harford has examined each of these theories with infinite patience and careful scholarship, and, in so doing, rendered a valuable service to the serious student of the Old Testament. The final word about Ezekiel has not yet been written, but whoever attempts to write it will have to take into consideration both the theory of Herntrich and the way in which it has influenced the interesting conclusions at which Canon Battersby Harford has arrived.

S. L. BROWN.

WHEN THE CHURCH WAS VERY YOUNG. By Ernest G. Loosley. Allen and Unwin. 3s. 6d.

Only the title of this book is reminiscent of Mr. A. A. Milne. It is not intended to be a book for children. Mr. Loosley, who is a Methodist minister, writes in an attractive manner. He gives a popular and well-informed account of selected aspects of the life of the primitive Church. The contents of his book are sufficiently indicated by the chapter headings, which read as follows: When the Church was very young it had—no buildings, no denominations, no fixed organization, no New Testament, no vocabulary of its own, no dogmatic system, no Sabbath rest (in the Gentile world); but it did possess—an experience, a store of teaching from Christ, a gospel. The reader may be led by these headings to expect a tirade against *organized* Christianity. But the book is not of that kind at all. The author makes a certain number of suggestions about the work of the Church at the present time, but for the most part these suggestions, where they are drastic, are too vague and, where they are definite, are somewhat trivial or commonplace.

ALEC VIDLER, O.G.S.

THE ATONEMENT. By the Bishop of Gloucester. Hodder and Stoughton. 5s.

This book consists of three lectures, which the Bishop of Gloucester delivered at King's College, London, in his capacity as Frederick Denison Maurice lecturer. Only a rather sketchy treatment of a vast subject was possible; the Bishop hopes to deal with it much more fully in a future volume. His treatment of the subject here is chiefly historical. His method is not to analyze the Christian experience of redemption, but rather to expound the teaching about the atonement which is contained in the New Testament and in the work of the Church's theologians.

Some readers will consider that, in this as in his other writings, Dr. Headlam is over confident that "the narrative and teaching contained in

the Synoptic Gospels . . . is substantially accurate," and that he does not make adequate allowance for the effects of modern criticism. At the same time, his stringent animadversions on some theories that have been put forward in the name of criticism are doubtless justified. His discussion, *e.g.*, of Mark x. 45, which was so conveniently and ingeniously eliminated by Dr. Rashdall, is particularly apt.

The main point, which Dr. Headlam emphasizes throughout these lectures, is "that we must look on the Redemption of Mankind not as accomplished by any sort of transaction, but as won for mankind by the life, work, and death of Jesus Christ." The mistake of much Christian theology, he holds, is that it has limited the atonement to the Cross. While the Cross was central, the redeeming work of Christ included His whole life and teaching, His resurrection, the coming of the Spirit, and the founding of the Church. But why stop there, as the Bishop appears to do? The redemption of mankind was not completed in thirty years, any more than it was in three hours; would it not be true to say that the redeeming action of Christ was begun in the way the Bishop describes, that its completion was potentially present in its initiation, but that the atonement itself is a continuing, dynamic process? In this case a theory of the atonement should be based on the whole redeeming action of Christ in the history of the Church, in Christian experience both individual and corporate. It is misleading and insufficient to treat the initiation of redemption as though it constituted the whole process. Dr. Headlam would perhaps admit the justice of this point of view, and it may be expected that he will take it into account in his fuller work on the subject. Meanwhile, the present volume, which is characterized by its author's customary lucidity of statement, provides a brief, but balanced and judicious, exposition of Christian belief.

ALEC VIDLER, O.G.S.

THE CREED AND ITS CREDENTIALS. By Lumsden Barkway, Bishop of Bedford. S.P.C.K. 2s. and 3s.

The writer has in mind, not those who "set up a false antagonism between Creed and Conduct," but the many earnest questioners who doubt if today "a thinker can retain his intellectual honesty and repeat what the Creeds say." Such of the latter as read this book will find in it great comfort and reassurance. For the Bishop writes, not as a professor among his books, but as one who knows in real life the educated man and his perplexities. Not that the books are lacking, for the author is widely read in theology and in literature and other lore, and at every turn can produce testimony from ancients and moderns—especially, which is his aim, the moderns—to support his argument.

His method is most systematic; each article is examined under numbered heads—*e.g.*, "The Four Alternative Views" of Christ's person; the "Historical, Intuitional, Pragmatic" proofs of His deity; and thus throughout the book. He takes great care also to explain important words, as in chap. xi., sin, forgiveness, emotion, will, repentance, faith; for he knows by experience how much of doubt is due to mere confusion of thought. This clear treatment makes this work eminently suitable for "Class Discussion," with a view to which questions on each chapter are appended. A class will not find that system and accuracy mean heaviness, for the style is lively and vigorous, and telling phrases and remarks abound.

"If we cast about to find some fault in this excellent defence of our religion, we might wish for it to be made plainer that forgiveness, justification, real and effective as they are, yet are initial and provisional. That is the lesson of the Unmerciful Servant parable. St. Paul himself buffeted his body, lest, after all, he should be a castaway."

Then, some of us would like to raise two points in those discussions. Physicists, like Professor Crowther in *The Great Design*, are telling us that the whole physical universe, our bodies included, consists of radiation. Hence, as the Bishop says (p. 51), the Gospel accounts of the Risen Christ are easier for us today. But radiation does not belong to the realm of spirit. The Christian metaphysic is sacramental; and St. Paul in Rom. viii. would have us to know that so it will be ever for the sons of God in glory. Wherefore, at a discussion we might move that in the sentence (p. 51), "A Christian believes that it (matter) is the temporary instrument of spiritual forces," the word "temporary" be omitted.

Again, many would uphold (p. 113) the word "Flesh" in the creed as the best still, as in the days of the Fathers, wherewith to combat a philosophy widely current now, as then, which reckons as unreal or base God's material creation; and therefore denies Christ's bodily Resurrection, explains away Sacraments, and offers a future life quite inconceivable for us men, and quite uninteresting. But certainly we have to teach that "flesh" does not mean, as has been too much thought, "identical particles"—the great Origen and St. Gregory of Nyssa never held that—but "man," man in the fulness of his being. In Psalm lvi. "flesh" and "man" are parallel; in the Athanasian Creed "flesh" and "manhood"; the great verse, "The Word was made flesh," is rendered in the Nicene Creed "and was made man."

On p. 128 the reading should no doubt be "the first chapter of the First and Third Gospels."

J. O. NASH, C.R.

VALUE AND EXISTENCE. N. O. Lossky and J. S. Marshall. Part I. translated from the Russian by S. S. Vinokooroff. G. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

An introductory note to this pleasing little volume points out that its two authors have worked in independence, and thus each writer assumes responsibility only for his own contribution. The core of the book is a translation from the Russian of an *opusculum* by Professor Lossky; the Preface and Part II. are an interpretation of Professor Lossky's Theory of Value from the pen of the Professor of Philosophy at Albion College, U.S.A.

Professor Lossky's study might be aptly termed "a Metaphysical Essay." He is primarily concerned to argue for the ultimate identity of the *bonum* and the *ens* and thus quotes with full approval St. Augustine's *dictum*, "*In quantum est quidquid est, bonum est*" (*De vera rel.*, xi.). On page 59 he gives us a summary statement of his position. "The Absolute fulness of the Divine Being is absolute perfection, worthy of unconditioned approval—something of such a character that it not only exists, but is worth existing. It is Goodness itself." The roots of this metaphysic, which has a long history behind it, are, of course, to be discovered much further back than the beginnings of the Christian Church, but its principles have become so closely interwoven with the texture of Christian thought

that today any defence of it is almost a certain sign of the religious convictions of any advocate of it. Professor Lossky, at any rate, is not afraid to disclose that for him Ultimate Truth and the Christian Revelation are identical.

In collecting material to substantiate his position, Professor Lossky has gone far beyond the literature of orthodox Theism. He has drawn widely upon most of the writers who in the last half-century have contributed towards the development in Germany and Austria of a *Wertphilosophie*. Brentano, Meinong, Ehrenfels, Scheler, Heyde, and Nicolai Hartmann are all judiciously exploited, while the writer's terminology reveals in places indebtedness to Hegel and also to Husserl (e.g., in his use of the word "intentional" in the sense now usual among the Phenomenologists). The book also makes evident a fact of which some of the advocates of a *Wertphilosophie* are probably unaware, namely that the whole idea of a hierarchy of values, a *Rangordnung der Werte*, as it finds expression in contemporary moral philosophy, is a direct heritage of the Christian Tradition. On p. 143 the writer himself draws up a "Table of Values." At the summit stand the "Primordial all-embracing absolute intrinsic values, [viz.] God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit."

In many of its details, Professor Lossky has also illuminating things to say. Interesting evidence in support of the ultimate identity of the *ens* and the *bonum* is derived from the experiences of the mystics (Suso and Florensky). The implications of the idea of value for the permanence of personal identity is also worked out at length. Our world contains a "multitude of substantival agents" which possess consubstantiality, but an "abstract consubstantiality" as contrasted with the "concrete consubstantiality" of the Trinity. In common with most Eastern theologians, Professor Lossky sees the ideal of human life in deification (*θέωσις*), alternatively described as the establishment of the "Kingdom of God." The process of deification leads to increasing concreteness. "Each new level of unification shews a higher, more complex, and more diverse activity than that of the preceding stages. On the ground of abstract consubstantiality higher and higher levels of concrete consubstantiality are thus gradually realized" (pp. 75 f.).

We hope enough has been said to shew that the book is one which no serious student of Christian moral philosophy should overlook.

F. L. CROSS.

METHODISM AND POLITICS, 1791-1851. By E. R. Taylor. Cambridge University Press, 1935. Price 7s. 6d.

Mr. Taylor is concerned in this book to shew how it came about that the Methodist Movement, which began its course in close association with Tory politics, found itself somewhat over fifty years later to a great extent in alliance with political Liberalism. The solution he gives is a straightforward one. In its earlier stages the movement was dominated by the personality of John Wesley; and John Wesley, we are reminded, "was a paternalist in matters of government all through the half-century when Methodism was organized, and he stamped his personality upon every part of the machine he made" (p. 44). But such a position was historically an anomaly. "The Church of England was traditionally Tory, the sects traditionally Whig," and thus in the years following Wesley's death "Methodism's position remained doubtful" (p. 52). Mr. Taylor contends

that the subsequent transition to Liberalism was almost inevitable in view of the "equalitarian" view of human society implicit in Methodist principles. For though (as he is no doubt right in insisting against Mr. Warner in his *Wesleyan Movement and the Industrial Revolution*) the Movement can be properly understood only as a religious, and not as a political movement, it very soon imbibed the political doctrine of "Natural Rights." The "Wesleyan Reaction," that phase in the Movement which sought to sustain Wesley's paternalism, thus found itself forced to capitulate.

The volume brings together in a convenient way a large amount of material bearing upon the history of Wesleyanism. The author betrays by his terminology his unfamiliarity with Sacramental theology, for more than once he refers to the "Sacramentarianism" (pp. 109, 121) of the Oxford Movement, where presumably he means something quite different.

F. L. CROSS.

THE FUTURE LIFE. A New Interpretation of the Christian Doctrine.
By F. A. M. Spencer, D.D.

Dr. Spencer's autobiographical introduction is not reassuring. To base the case for immortality on the nature of the self would seem a rash project in view of the criticisms to which that concept has been subjected at the hands of philosophers. But even so, he is clear that the religious consciousness demands something more than mere continued existence; it demands "an assurance of increasing life." To shew how special revelation supplements and corrects general revelation he outlines the history of the development of the belief from early Hebrew religion, through Judaism, down to the Apostolic Age. But the introduction of chapters on Greek speculation, psychic communications and evolutionary immortality, coming at this point, seriously confuses the issue; and the references to the banal utterances of familiar spirits and the nationalist Messianism of Lutoslawski only reveal the defects in the author's philosophy of revelation. He combines a tendency to view all problems of speculative theology from the human end with a naive confidence in the utterances of any and every writer who has burst into print. While his distinction between the individual and corporate aspects of resurrection is of undoubted value, we do not think that he can claim to have uttered a new interpretation of the Christian doctrine.

G. L. PHILLIPS.

THE GREAT FRIENDSHIP. By R. H. Moberly. Hamish Hamilton.
4s. 6d.

The Principal of Cheshunt has written simply and attractively of a great subject. His book had its origin in instructions given to Confirmation candidates; the theme was more fully developed in the White lectures delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral in Lent, 1930, and has been still further elaborated in this book. The author has had in mind that not inconsiderable body of people who, while friendly to the Christian religion, are often, as they say, "put off" by orthodox Christian thought; and he has endeavoured to help such people to think out the accepted beliefs and to consider how far they fit into the general scheme of human experience. So he writes of Christianity as the great friendship; friendship with the Father,

friendship with His Son through the Holy Spirit by means of the Sacraments, friendship in the fellowship of the Church and friendship with that great company of the redeemed, both living and departed, who make up the Communion of Saints. It is a great theme worthily treated, for though the illustrations are often so homely as to seem almost too daring, set in so lofty a context, there is throughout the book an atmosphere of reverence and sincerity which compels attention.

One of his chapters is entitled "Friendship as Food." It is not so that men commonly think or speak of Friendship, and yet in a real sense human friendships nourish and sustain the life of man. The influence of friend upon character of friend is imbibed, absorbed, digested, just as physical food is received and reacts upon the physical life; but there is one friendship, one form of spiritual food, which alone is utterly pure and ennobling, and this is offered to us in the Gospels, for it is the very friendship of God Himself. At the heart of Christian life lies the thought of fellowship or communion; it is the message declared in the first Epistle of St. John: "That ye also may have fellowship with us; yea and our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ"; and this communion is holy since it belongs to God. So the writer reminds us that "every part of Christian life is really included in 'Holy Communion'; for it all has its place in the one great Sacrament which wholly satisfies and sustains, which never fails to strengthen, bless and purify." D. ARMYTAGE.

Robertus Kilwardby, O.P.: DE NATURA THEOLOGICÆ. Ad fidem manusciporum edidit Fridericus Stegmüller. Münster (Aschendorff), 1935. Pp. 56. Price RM. 1.10.

This is the text of the Prologue to Robert Kilwardby's *Commentary on the Sentences*, edited for the first time. The bulk of the *Commentary* is accessible only in manuscript. The writer is remembered for having condemned as heretical, though himself a Dominican, several propositions derived from the works of St. Thomas; this was in 1277, just over four years after he had become Archbishop of Canterbury. The editing of this *opusculum* strikes us as admirable. F. L. CROSS.

HIS LIFE IN PRAYER. By Paul B. Bull, C.R. S.P.C.K. 2s.

This latest publication of a veteran mission priest and well-known spiritual writer will be welcomed by many. The book is exactly what we want to put into the hands of any thoughtful person who feels their prayer life is getting cramped. It could be used with great advantage by priests or layfolk in times of Retreat or at a Quiet Day and be sure by its scriptural character and the prominence it gives to adoration to bring light and freshness to devotion. R. D. MIDDLETON.

FOR YOUTH AND THE YEARS. Studies in the Christian Faith. By T. Grigg-Smith. S.P.C.K. 2s.

We hope this volume, despite its unattractive appearance, will find its way into the study of many clergy and church workers. It is not a book

to read through but to ponder over. As an urge to deeper thinking and wider reading it will be very useful. As a textbook for Study Circles it will be found helpful and stimulating.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

THE JEWISH CARAVAN. Great Stories of Twenty-five Centuries. Selected and edited by Leo W. Schwarz. Arthur Barker Ltd. 10s. 6d.

This collection of tales will be a joy to all lovers of Judaism, as illustrating the life, thought and feeling of a truly remarkable race for wellnigh three thousand years. The compiler, in making his selections, has gleaned in many fields—the old Testament, the Apocrypha, Josephus, the Acts of the Apostles, many mediæval, a few Hasidic and a host of modern writers. Some of the extracts from mediæval Jewish literature have been already given by B. Halper in his valuable anthology *Post-Biblical Hebrew Literature*, published in 1921 in two volumes of texts, notes and translations. It would have added to the usefulness of the work from the point of view of the student if Mr. Schwarz had indicated as carefully as Halper has done the chapter, section or page of the editions from which he has drawn his material. The second half of the book dealing with modern Jewish literature will be especially welcome; its value is increased by the short biographical notes with which this section is concluded.

Of the entire work we may say with a recent reviewer of L. I. Newman's *Hasidic Anthology*: "Here is to be found the wisdom of oppressed genius, the gentle irony of the suffering philosopher, the profound thought of the saint lost in contemplation of eternity" (*J.Q.R.* xxvi., p. 96), as well as the cry of a long suffering people. Here too we find that spirit of devotion to God, that sense of the joy and solemnity of life, that secret enshrined in the heart of Judaism which reveals itself only to the reverent and sympathetic student—

"For everybody may come
To study; none will gainsay;
Yet to sing the true Torah song
—Of a thousand just one knows the way."

DAVID SHIMONOVITCH. *Quoted on p. 739.*

R. D. MIDDLETON.

THE CHRISTIAN FAITH AND MODERN DOUBT. By George A. Buttrick. Chas. Scribner's Sons. 8s. 6d.

This is a disappointing book. The wrapper declares that it is a "book which will lead the reader from a labyrinth of questioning about life into a realm of assurance"; but after reading it carefully, and in spite of its style, which is one of great assurance, we are left with the same kind of uncertainty which Plutarch reveals in that letter to his wife upon the death of their little daughter wherein he says: "Since to disbelieve them (i.e., the ancient customs of the Fathers) is harder than to believe, let us comply with the law. . . ." Perhaps Dr. Buttrick tries to prove too much in what, by his own confession, is intended to be only a preface to a restatement of the Christian Faith; perhaps his constant condemnation of the Church of past ages as a blind leader of the blind makes us wonder wherein lies the root of this bitterness; perhaps his airy statement that evidence for the Virgin

Birth is self-contradictory and insufficient and that we do not know whether our Lord is Virgin-born, nor do we need to know, makes us instinctively mistrust other statements made with equal certitude; but in effect his argument produces more of doubt than of certainty. He has a chapter in the middle of the book entitled "The Finality of Jesus." It is open to question whether "finality" can ever be properly used of Him Who is the eternal I Am; but presumably the word is used by Dr. Buttrick in the sense of "complete," "utterly fulfilling" or "satisfying." If so, one would have expected a clear declaration that such "finality" is possible only because He is Very God of Very God; but we are not so assured. True, the crucial passages in the Creed of Nicæa are quoted; but if, as he says, "A Creed should be more akin to poetry than to logic," then sentences such as "Jesus is God's last and best disclosure" may be only a poetic way of saying that in Him the goodness of God shone with a clearness never before seen in humanity; or it may be meant to convey (as we are sure the writer really intends) that "He is the brightness of his glory and the express image of His person." The central fact of Christianity—indeed it may without exaggeration be said the one fact—which alone can bring assurance to a world in doubt is the deity of the Lord Christ. Dr. Buttrick owes it to his readers to say this often, to say it clearly, and to make it the central theme of a book bearing such a title.

D. ARMYTAGE.

SÖREN KIERKEGAARD, HIS LIFE AND RELIGIOUS TEACHING. By John A. Bain, M.A., D.D. S.C.M. Press. 4s. 6d.

Dr. Bain deserves our warmest thanks for this book, which will be for most English people their first introduction to one of the great thinkers of the nineteenth century. Søren Kierkegaard is not a writer who can be understood and appreciated apart from the circumstances of his time or his personal history, and therefore it is well that we are given so good an account of a life and temperament that are naturally but little known. There was, *e.g.*, insanity in his family, but this must not hinder us from thinking of him as a genius. "A genius," he says, "is like a thunderstorm: he comes up against the wind, frightens people and clears the air," and no doubt he is speaking of himself; and Dr. Bain would, we hope, agree with this self-estimate, though he writes as a calm critic, rather than as an enthusiast.

We cannot feel that quite enough space or sympathy has been given to Kierkegaard's teaching on Christianity as the religion of Paradox. The poignant interest of "Enten-Eller" has passed: the personal controversies and attacks on the Church are now unimportant: the beauty of the language is lost upon us: the devotional addresses are searching, but not epoch-making; but Kierkegaard's teaching on the Religion of the Incarnation demands more than a hasty consideration. This teaching can be stated in the following propositions:

The Incarnation itself, the supreme paradox, involves a stiff examination for the mind before it can be a blessing. The Life on earth of the Incarnate is that of a Sign. A sign cannot make itself plain—it is rightly understood only by faith. Thus Christ is "signum contradictionis": He presents His contemporaries with the possibility of being upset in Him, as being different from the expected. The Penitent Thief is the typical Christian—

"the only Christian contemporary with Christ," S. K. would say—because he did not judge according to the appearance, but saw through in faith to the majesty of Christ. But we are just as much contemporaries with Christ in His humiliation as were the Jews. Christianity is still the religion of those who have faith to recognize the love and personal visitation of God in a questionable form: indeed anything in dogmatics or ethics distinctively Christian is knowable as such by the fact that it can be spoken against with a fair show of reason.

The portions of Kierkegaard's writings, which Dr. Bain has well translated, are carefully selected. The famous passage about the lily and the bad bird is here, and a discourse on Job, who "fought the frontier battles" on the way to the possession of the full Christian outlook, and something from "Indövelse i Kristendom." But the second part on "Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me" deserves translating too, and we would suggest that one day Dr. Bain should give us in English the whole book, which is so characteristic of Kierkegaard's thought and easier than "Afsluttende Uridenskabelig Ejterskrift."

On the influence of Kierkegaard on Ibsen there is a suprising passage in the Introduction (p. 11), which seems to imply that Brand was a real Norwegian pastor, inspired by S. K., and inspiring Ibsen to write his great poem. This is surely not the case. And naturally we should have liked a little more on the fascinating problem of the indebtedness of Karl Barth and his followers to Kierkegaard; but that is because no debt has yet been acknowledged. We must await something upon this matter from Germany.

F. W. FULFORD.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE IN THE MIDDLE AGES AND OTHER ESSAYS. By F. M. Powicke. Clarendon Press. Pp. 168. 10s. net.

The Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford has given us in this volume eight Essays dealing with the Middle Ages on subjects so diverse as, *Dante and the Crusade*, *Medieval Education*, *Gerald of Wales*, and *Loretta, Countess of Leicester*, an anchoress of some note in her day, whose memory has almost perished. Nevertheless there is a common thread running through these Essays which gives them a certain unity. This thread is the attempt to illustrate from various departments of life certain problems which are, indeed, perennial but were more urgent in the Middle Ages than we sometimes realize. Of these problems the most prominent one is the eternal conflict between liberty and order.

The Essays are not light reading and make a demand on the intelligence and knowledge of the reader. But those who read with understanding will be rewarded. The Essays open up new vistas, besides presenting many suggestive and challenging opinions. Here are a few:

"The history of the Church is the record of the gradual and mutual adaptation of Christianity and paganism to each other."

"What we call abuses or superstitions in the mediæval Church were part of the price paid for, not obstacles to, its universality."

"In the Middle Ages the hold of the Church was due to the fact that it could satisfy the best cravings of the whole man, his love of beauty, his desire for goodness, his endeavour after truth." He also asks one pertinent question: "How did the mediæval Church maintain a hold so hardly won in early times, so easily lost in our own?"

These Essays are a real contribution to our knowledge and understanding of the Middle Ages. They should be read before or after the study of Professor Kirk's Lectures on The Vision of God.

C. P. S. CLARKE.

THE PAIN OF THIS WORLD AND THE PROVIDENCE OF GOD. By M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. Longmans. 5s.

Mr. D'Arcy gives us a Platonic dialogue, in which a philosopher, a scientist, an artist, a mystic and a priest take part in a discussion on "Providence." The title of the book indicates the scope of the discussion, though we doubt whether such a title will commend it to the general public. It is, however, only the highly trained mind that will be able to follow the argument through all its ramifications, so it is scarcely a book for the general reader.

The opener of the discussion is determined to stick to reason. He is not going to capitulate to the sentimental view that nothing can be made of the subject of Providence except by taking refuge in "faith." Nor has he any use for the conception which enjoyed a fleeting popularity some years ago, of a finite God. The argument put forward is that, despite all its evil, the world is supremely worth living in. The very fact that we lament the shortness of life shews that we believe it to be good while it lasts. It is, moreover, the only world fit to live in for beings constituted as we are. "To ask for a change is as absurd as a turbot asking to be a humming-bird under water." Here the writer follows the same line of thought as Dr. Carnegie Simpson in his telling little book of apologetic, *The Fact-of-Christ*. The resistances of this world, the plagues to be conquered and handicaps to be overcome, are shewn to be necessary to the development of man. Further, the liberty which God gives us to make or mar our own destinies carries with it the responsibility for its misuse. There remains therefore no excuse for throwing upon God the blame for man's wrongdoing.

To this thesis various objections are raised. From the side of Christianity, it is urged that it is not enough to stage a trial, as it were, and acquit God of murder and cruelty. From the atheist quarter comes the objection that the existence of God is uncertain and therefore it is begging the question to argue about God's tolerance of evil: we should argue from evil to the negation of God. The opener neatly replies to these and other questions, and the argument becomes more lively as the dialogue progresses. The priest comes in at the conclusion. No doubt what he said is appropriate to the informal discussions which had preceded it, but from the point of view of the reader his is the most disappointing contribution. To have rounded off the argument triumphantly and presented us with a symmetrical summary would have been inartistic and unlike real life, where arguments are seldom neatly gathered up. But it would have been far more serviceable to the reader.

This book should be read, and reread, by those whose task it is to defend the Faith. Not the least of its merits is its abhorrence of the facile solution. The principal speaker remains severely logical throughout, though realizing that, after all, "it is more important to get our heads into heaven than to get heaven into our heads."

M. DONAVAN.

THE LOGIC OF WILLIAM OF OCKHAM. By Ernest A. Moody. Pp. xiv+322. Sheed and Ward. 12s. 6d.

Pereant qui ante, etc., is a sentiment tempting, no doubt, to anyone who cares for his subject so intensely as Dr. Moody does, and Ritter, Stöckl, Gilson, De Wulf and Ross are all in turn passed in review and either found wanting, not always too courteously, as in the reference to the "groundless character" of a statement by De Wulf, or patted *de haut en bas*, as when the Provost of Oriel's life's work on Aristotle is rewarded with the concession that he "shews some appreciation" of a particular point. None the less Dr. Moody has earned the credit of producing the most noteworthy book on Ockham's approach to philosophy and his method which has appeared for many years. His preliminary survey of Ockham's relation to the Scholastic Tradition does not, perhaps, except for an indication of what is to follow, contain anything particularly novel when compared with previous writers such as Dr. R. L. Poole, Federhofer, H. Abbagnano and Pelzer; but it illustrates the real difficulty experienced by students owing to the venerable antiquity as well as the comparative scarcity of the editions with which they have to work. The remaining chapters on "The Logic of Terms," "Porphyry and the Problem of Universals," "The Categories of Aristotle," "Forms of Complex Signification," "Demonstration and Definition" and "The *Consequentiae*—Conclusion" present a resolute attempt at re-examination and restatement which even those who may wonder if the author is not at times endeavouring to make his demonstration of what Ockham must have meant too complete will recognize as extraordinarily interesting. Sometimes they might even ask for more, *e.g.* in regard to what is described as Ockham's "heroic effort" to save Porphyry's text in respect of his use of "accident," or when Dr. Moody says that "Ockham's characteristic method of analyzing those terms which do not signify individual substances or qualities *per se*, but which are different modes of signifying individual substances and qualities either conjunctively or connotatively, has been sufficiently illustrated in the discussion of quantity, relation and quality," and that therefore little need be said of the other categories. Time and place do indeed receive a page, but action and passion, position and state might well have tempted him to further expositions. For if to some students the observations on Averroes and Avicenna, Aquinas and Duns Scotus will have special interest, and it may be satisfactory to be given reasons for supposing that the "averroists themselves were not such hypocrites as some have pictured them," the real importance of the book is in the effort (a) to make "Ockham's Aristotle" more evident to the reader, (b) to exhibit Ockham as he is when in the second part of the *summa totius logicæ* in the analysis of the proposition he allows himself the aid of a different language and method, (c) to estimate the importance and meaning of Ockham's "Nominalism." And there is a suggestion for future work in the observation that "To what degree Ockham's own conception of the principles and methods of natural philosophy was perpetuated or developed by the later nominalists, and to what extent Ockham can be considered a 'forerunner' of the modern scientific spirit, is a problem that cannot be settled even with a remote degree of historical accuracy, until the available but largely unexamined sources of the later period of scholasticism receive adequate and accurate study."

CLAUDE JENKINS.